DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 416 EA 009 339

AUTHOR Nighswander, James K.
TITLE The Perceived Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining on Schools and Colleges--A Survey of North Central Association Administrators. Final Report.
INSTITUTION North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Chicago, Ill. Commission on Research and Service.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 105p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Collective Bargaining; Community Colleges; Educational Problems; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; High Schools; Junior Colleges; *Principals; *School Superintendents; *Surveys; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Community College Presidents; *North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

ABSTRACT

This investigation focused on two basic areas: (1) administrators' ratings of their institutions, job roles, and educational problems and issues, and (2) the perceived effects of collective bargaining on schools and colleges. The study sample included high school principals, school superintendents, and community college presidents within the 19-state North Central Association region. The results showed that administrators on all three levels highly rated their schools and colleges on important quality variables. Collective bargaining has apparently had minimal impact on students or instructional programs. But administrators perceived far more negative rather than positive effects associated with collective bargaining. In fact, the only positive effects of collective bargaining, in the opinion of these administrators, have accrued to teachers in the form of salary increases, fringe benefits, and improved working conditions. The author concludes that the collective bargaining process has had either a neutral or, in some cases, a negative effect on the education enterprise, but not a positive one. (Author)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED136416

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA SP
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. HE

# THE PERCEIVED EFFECTS OF TEACHER COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES – A SURVEY OF NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION ADMINISTRATORS

Final Report of a Survey Study Conducted by

**The Committee on Administrative Roles**

of the

**NCA Council on Research and Service**

Prepared by

James K. Nighswander, Ph.D.
Committee Co-Chairperson

April, 1977

EA 009 339

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page(s) |
|---|---|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Method | 1– 3 |
| Sample | 1– 2 |
| Instrumentation | 2 |
| Data Collection | 2– 3 |
| Analysis | 3 |
| RESULTS | 3–16 |
| Background Information – Part I | 3– 4 |
| General Impressions – Part II | 5 |
| Institutional Quality Ratings – Part III | 5– 9 |
| Quality Ratings | 5– 6 |
| Effects of Collective Bargaining | 7 |
| Organizational Variables | 8– 9 |
| Administrative Roles and Functions – Part IV | 9–12 |
| Importance Ratings | 9–10 |
| Effects of Collective Bargaining | 10–11 |
| Organizational Variables | 11–12 |
| Problems and Issues in Education – Part V | 12–16 |
| Severity Ratings | 12–13 |
| Effects of Collective Bargaining | 13–14 |
| Organizational Variables | 14–16 |
| DISCUSSION | 16–20 |
| HIGHLIGHTS OF THE STUDY | 20–22 |
| A Congruence of Results on the Effects of Collective Bargaining | 20–21 |
| A Contrast of Results on the Effects of Collective Bargaining | 21–22 |
| SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 22–24 |
| APPENDIX | 25–74 |
| Superintendent/Principal Survey Instrument | 26–29 |
| Community College President Survey Instrument | 30–33 |
| Tables 1 through 126 | 34–74 |

## INTRODUCTION

A phenomenon of the past two decades has been the advent of collective bargaining in the public sector. A paucity of research about this important issue exists. In fact, since the early 1970's the apparent quantity of research into the effects of collective bargaining has diminished, and yet collective bargaining continues to increase as a function of the desire of public employees. There has been a steady growth to influence their "world of work" with bargaining agreements within the public sector. Some states have passed legislation mandating collective bargaining and there has been a dramatic increase in the number of public employee strikes across the country.

In view of the impact of collective bargaining and the absence of concrete information on the effects of teacher bargaining on schools and colleges, the North Central Association Commission on Research and Service appointed a study committee to conduct an investigation. The Committee on Administrative Roles was formed for the purpose of studying the perceived effects of collective bargaining on significant educational, institutional and administrative variables by those who are in, perhaps, the best position to assess the effects – front line administrators. The reality of collective bargaining may have import for the concept of accreditation.

The Committee on Administrative Roles was appointed by the Commission on Research and Service in the summer of 1975. Representatives from all levels of NCA membership – schools, community and junior colleges and universities – were included on the committee. A study proposal was submitted to the Commission at its annual meeting held in Bloomington, Indiana in September, 1975. With several minor modifications, the study proposal was accepted and financial support was provided.

During the fall and winter of 1975 and early 1976 the Committee developed the survey instruments and made plans for the collection and analysis of survey data. The university representative resigned from the committee during the instrument development stage. Because of a tight schedule for conducting the study, no replacement was sought and the university portion of the study was dropped.

### Method

#### Sample

The study sample included high school principals, school superintendents and community college presidents. Survey instruments were mailed to 300 principals, 300 superintendents and 250 community college presidents within the nineteen state North Central Association region.

A systematic sampling procedure was used. The first subject was selected at random and every *i* th member of the population, as necessary to obtain the desired sample size, was selected. This procedure guaranteed representativeness by state. The 1975 NCA Membership Roster was used as the population source.

## Instrumentation

Two five-part survey instruments were developed by the study committee. The instruments, containing many identical items, were developed for (a) principals and superintendents and (b) community college presidents.

Part I of the survey instrument was designed to obtain important background information on the individual respondent and his/her school, district or college. Part II, entitled "General Impressions," contained statements about collective bargaining to which respondents indicated agreement or disagreement on a six-point Likert-type scale. The principals/superintendents instrument contained seven items in Part II and the community college presidents instrument contained six items.

Part III was a rating scale used by respondents to rate their respective schools/districts/colleges on thirteen Institutional Quality variables. Administrators from institutions with collective bargaining were to complete additional ratings on the perceived "effects of collective bargaining" on the institutional quality variables. A four-point scale was used in rating the variables on quality (outstanding, good, fair, poor) and a three point scale was used for specifying the effects of teacher bargaining (strengthened, no effect, weakened).

Part IV of the instruments provided for importance ratings on various Administrative Roles and Functions. Respondents were asked to rate the roles and functions, in terms of perceived importance, using a five-point scale. Administrators working in schools/districts/colleges with collective bargaining were instructed to indicate whether collective bargaining had "strengthened," "weakened" or had "no effect" on each of the roles and functions.

Part V of the survey instrument dealt with Problems and Issues in Education. Administrators rated each problem or issue on "present severity" and their prediction of "future severity." Five-point scales were used for both ratings. Administrators from organizations with collective bargaining rated "positive," "detrimental" or "no effects" of collective bargaining on each problem and issue.

## Data Collection

Survey instruments were mailed to the sample during the first three weeks of March, 1976. Each survey was accompanied by a cover letter describing the intent of the study and potential value of the results. A stamped envelope was enclosed for the return of the completed instrument.

The surveys were not coded in any way. Respondents were advised that confidentiality was assured. In an effort to follow-up on subjects who failed to complete and return the instrument, the entire sample was mailed a post card reminder two weeks after the initial mailing.

Analysis

Analyses consisted of computing (a) numbers and percentages responding to each response option and (b) comparative analyses within and among groups using the Chi Square ($X^2$) test for independent samples. In all cases of reported statistical significance, a $p. < .05$ applies.

Parts III, IV and V of the instrument required completion of the perceived "effects of collective bargaining" on each of the variables listed. Only those from schools/districts/colleges with collective bargaining completed the "effects" ratings. These "effects" analyses are, therefore, based on a smaller number of subjects and on basically different groups than the quality, importance and severity ratings of Parts III, IV and V.

The analyses reported here include among-groups comparisons on all quality, importance and severity ratings and corresponding perceptions of the "effects of collective bargaining." Also included are within-groups analyses using size of organization, control of organization (public-non-public), collective bargaining (with and without) and years engaged in collective bargaining on the quality, importance, and severity ratings and the perceptions of the "effects of collective bargaining" on all variables under investigation.

## RESULTS

### Background Information – Part I

Principals returned the highest percentage of usable survey instruments. Of the 300 mailed to high school principals, 224 were completed and returned, one came back marked undeliverable and 17 were in unusable form due to failure to follow instructions. The net return for principals was a 75% total with 69% returned in usable form (Table I). The superintendents group returned a total of 165 completed instruments and five undeliverable. The total return accounted for was 70% with 63% returned in usable form. Community college presidents returned 184 instruments out of 300 mailed for a 61% return figure. Seven of the 184 were not usable for data analysis purposes.

Most of the principals (see Table I) were from 9-12 (59%) and 10-12 schools (30%). The majority represented public schools (95%). Seventy-one percent of the principals came from mid-sized schools (400-2000 enrollments) with the remainder about evenly split between small and large schools (under 400 and over 2000).

Three-fourths of the principals who responded to the survey were from schools which provide collective bargaining for teachers and over half of those have had teacher bargaining for over six years. The vast majority of principals work in schools whose teachers who are affiliated with the National Education Association (84%) with some associated with the American Federation of Teachers (9%). Where there is principal involvement in the negotiations process, 40% have an active role and 36% a passive role. The remaining 24% serve in some other capacity in negotiations.

Table 2 shows the background information for superintendents. Nearly all superintendents worked in K-12 districts (94%) and all but one came from publicly funded districts (over 99%). The distribution among types of communities served was 13% urban, 24% suburban, 30% town and 34% rural. Three-fourths of the respondents came from districts in the 400-5000 enrollment classification. Another 17% were in larger districts with 5000-15000 enrollments and only 8% came from very small or very large school districts.

Nearly the same proportion of superintendents as principals were from districts with collective bargaining for teachers (76% yes vs 24% no). Sixty percent of those responding "yes," had engaged in collective bargaining for over six years. As with principals, in those districts with teacher bargaining,the local teacher groups tended to affiliate with the NEA (89%). Eight percent were associated with the AFT.

Slightly less than half (46%) of the superintendents work in districts which permit principal participation in teacher negotiations. Where participation does exist, 42% play an active role versus 27% who serve a passive role. Thirty-one percent reportedly do neither.

Background information on community college presidents may be found in Table 3. Among those presidents responding to the survey, 23% were from urban colleges, 27% suburban, 13% town and 37% from rural colleges. Most of the colleges represented were in the 1000-over 5000 enrollment classifications.

Two-thirds of the colleges represented (67%) were locally controlled, one-fourth state controlled and the remainder (9%) were non-public institutions.

Unlike the principals' and superintendents' results, less than half of the colleges have teacher collective bargaining (41% yes vs 50% no). Of those colleges which have collective bargaining, 46% have negotiated 6 or more years, 28% 4-6 years and 26% 0-3 years. Most (52%) of the college collective bargaining units are affiliated with NEA, but a substantial proportion (27%) have AFT affiliation.

About half (48%) of the colleges represented permit administrator or board member involvement in the teacher negotiations process and over three-fourths of those provide for active participation.

## General Impressions – Part II

Part II of the Survey Instrument contained general statements about the collective bargaining issue to which respondents indicated their agreement or disagreement on a six-point scale. A summary of the results, which are found in Table 4, follow:

a) There was strong agreement among all groups that *collective bargaining is becoming more prevalent in schools and colleges.*

b) There was general agreement that professional education associations and organizations understand the issue; however, community college presidents are less inclined to agree to the awareness of the issue than principals and superintendents.

c) The three groups agreed that *national professional associations and organizations (NCA and others) are doing a good job of keeping their members current on bargaining issues;* however, community college presidents are in less agreement than principals and superintendents.

d) Approximately two-thirds of the administrators agreed that *the administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations.* Community college presidents were less certain of this, however, than principals and superintendents.

e) Superintendents and principals were asked whether they agreed or disagreed that principals should be actively involved in negotiations. Most agreed that they should, but superintendents were in less agreement with the concept than were principals.

f) There was general agreement to the statement that *collective bargaining has forced administrators to share administrative decision making with teachers.* As observed with other statements, community college presidents agreed to a significant lesser extent than did principals and superintendents.

g) To the statement that *collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities given to the administrator,* a slight majority of superintendents and principals indicated their agreement. Community college presidents were almost evenly divided, with slightly more disagreeing to the statement than agreeing.

## Institutional Quality Ratings – Part III

### Quality Ratings

On Part III of the instrument, respondents were asked to rate the schools/districts/colleges on the following 13 institutional quality variables:

1. Instructional program
2. Extra-curricular programs
3. Community support of education
4. Staff morale
5. Inservice programs
6. Student academic achievement
7. Student morale
8. Intra-staff communications
9. Public relations
10. Professional staff salaries
11. Fringe benefits for professional staff
12. Physical facilities
13. Fiscal condition

A four-point rating scale from "outstanding" to "poor" was used. Administrators from organizations which engaged in collective bargaining with teachers were asked to indicate the "effects of negotiations" on each of the institutional variables using a three-point scale — "strengthened," "no effect" and "weakened."

The results of Part III may be found in Table 5 and Tables 8 through 53. There was a general tendency to rate the school/district/college/ as "outstanding" or "good." Over two-thirds of all three groups gave these ratings to their (a) *instructional program,* (b) *extra curricular activities,* (c) *staff morale,* (d) *academic achievement,* (e) *student morale,* (f) *professional staff salaries* and (g) *fringe benefits. Community support of education, intra-staff communications* and *public relations* were rated as good or outstanding by a majority of respondents but were not as highly rated by all three groups as those items listed above. Just over half of the principals rated *community support, public relations* and *staff communications* as "outstanding" or "good" in their schools. Superintendents and community college presidents gave slightly better rating to their organizations on these three variables. Over three-fourths of the community college presidents rated their *physical facilities* as "outstanding" or "good." Lower ratings were given by principals and superintendents. Those variables receiving the lowest ratings were (a) *inservice programs* and (b) *fiscal condition. Inservice programs* were rated as "fair" or "poor" by over half of each group. Over half the principals rated their schools' *fiscal condition* as "fair" or "poor" with superintendents and community college presidents giving slightly better *fiscal condition* ratings to their organizations.

Statistically significant among-groups differences in quality ratings were common. Of the thirteen quality variables rated, nine produced significant differences among the three administrator groups. Community college presidents were responsible for most of the differences in ratings. They tended to give higher (outstanding and good) ratings to their colleges than either principals or superintendents gave to their respective schools/districts. Those quality variables rated significantly higher by college presidents were: (a) *instructional programs,* (b) *community support of education,* (c) *staff morale,* (d) *student academic achievement,* (e) *student morale,* (f) *public relations,* (g) *fringe benefits,* (h) *physical facilities* and (i) *fiscal condition* (Tables 8 through 16). Community college presidents gave a significantly lower rating, relative to principals and superintendents, to *extra curricular programs* (Table 17).

## Effects of Collective Bargaining

Administrators working in institutions with collective bargaining were asked to rate the effects of collective bargaining on the thirteen school/district/college quality variables. Respondents were to indicate whether they thought collective bargaining had "strengthened," "weakened," or caused "no effect" on each variable.

Five of the thirteen variables were rated by large proportions from each group as having been "weakened" by collective bargaining. *Fiscal condition* received the greatest overall proportion of "weakened" responses, with over half of all three groups perceiving a "weakened" effect (Table 5). Other variables rated as "weakened" by collective bargaining were *community support of education, staff morale, intra-staff communications* and *public relations.* For each of these institutional variables, the "weakened" response was the most frequently selected of the three response options.

Two items, *professional staff salaries* and *fringe benefits for professional staff,* were rated by a majority of respondents as "strengthened" by collective bargaining. Well over two-thirds of all groups perceived strengthening effects on these two variables.

The other variables were perceived as having been largely unaffected by collective bargaining. Those considered least affected by approximately four-fifths of each group were *student academic achievement, student morale* and *physical facilities.*

The three survey groups differed from one another on six of the thirteen effects ratings. Community college presidents accounted for three of those differences. Greater proportions of college presidents than principals and superintendents reported "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on *instructional programs* and *inservice programs* (Tables 18 and 19). Although a large majority of all three groups reported that *professional staff salaries* had been "strengthened" by collective bargaining, that feeling was shared by a significantly smaller proportion of community college presidents (Table 20).

Superintendents responded in a significantly different manner on two of the institutional variables – *extra curricular activities* and *community support of education* (Tables 21 and 22). A much higher proportion of superintendents reported "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on *community support of education,* while a smaller proportion of superintendents perceived "weakened" effects on *extra-curricular activities.*

Principals were significantly different from superintendents and community college presidents on a single variable – *intra-staff communications* (Table 23). Nearly half of the superintendents and college administrators reported "weakened" effects on *intra-staff communications* as compared to less than one-third of the principals' group.

## Organizational Variables

Size. Statistically different response patterns within-groups on size of institution were observed for three of the institutional quality variables. Principals and community college presidents were different (within-groups) on ratings of (a) *instructional programs,* (b) *professional staff salaries* and (c) *fringe benefits for professional staff* (Tables 24, 25 and 26). In all cases, principals and community college presidents from the larger schools and colleges gave higher (outstanding, good) ratings to their institutions on these variables.

No statistically significant differences existed within-groups for superintendents or within any of the three administrator groups on "effects of collective bargaining" based on size of school/district/college.

Control of organization. Within-groups analyses on control of organization were possible only for principals and community college presidents. No non-public superintendents responded to the survey. The "effects of collective bargaining" analyses included only one group – community college presidents. No principals from non-public schools, who responded to the survey, worked in institutions with collective bargaining for teachers.

The quality ratings produced five within-groups differences. Principals from public funded and controlled schools rated *professional staff salaries* and *fringe benefits for professional staff* (Tables 27 and 28) more highly (outstanding or good) than did non-public principals. However, non-public principals gave higher ratings to *instructional programs* and *intra-staff communications* than their public school counterparts (Tables 29 and 30).

Community college presidents differed significantly on only one quality variable – *community support of education* (Table 31). Non-public presidents rated their colleges lower in *community support* than did presidents from state or locally controlled colleges. No differences within-groups were observed on the "effects of collective bargaining" ratings.

Years engaged in collective bargaining. The only within-groups differences on years engaged in collective bargaining were attributable to principals. Two quality variables were rated in significantly different ways – *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits* (Tables 32 and 33). In both cases, the longer the school district had provided collective bargaining, the more "outstanding" the salary and fringe benefits ratings by principals.

The significant "effects of collective bargaining" ratings included the two above (*salaries, fringe benefits*) plus another – *staff morale* (Tables 34, 35 and 36). The longer the school/district engaged in collective bargaining, the higher the "strengthened" ratings of collective bargaining effects on staff *salaries* and *fringe benefits.* The fewer the years engaged in collective bargaining, the more "weakened" were the perceived effects of teacher bargaining on *staff morale.*

Collective bargaining – with and without. Analyses were performed on within-groups differences between administrators from districts **with** and those **without** collective bargaining for teachers. These analyses were on the quality ratings exclusively since only those with collective bargaining completed the effects of negotiations ratings.

Eleven of the thirteen variables showed significant within-groups differences. The principals' group was different on ten institutional quality ratings. In eight of the ten significant differences for principals, principals from districts **without** collective bargaining gave higher quality ratings (outstanding, good) for their schools. Following are the eight variables so rated: (a) *staff morale,* (b) *fiscal condition,* (c) *community support of education,* (d) *intra-staff communications,* (e) *instructional programs,* (f) *extra curricular programs,* (g) *student achievement* and (h) *student morale* (Tables 37 through 44).

Two variables – *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits for professional staff* – were rated more highly (outstanding) by principals from districts **with** collective bargaining (Tables 45 and 46).

Significant differences between superintendents from districts **with** and those **without** collective bargaining were observed on three institutional quality variable ratings – *professional staff salaries, fringe benefits for professional staff* and *physical facilities* (Tables 47, 48 and 49 ). In all three cases, superintendents from districts **with** collective bargaining gave significantly higher (outstanding) ratings.

Community college presidents from colleges **with** and **without** teacher bargaining were different on four of the quality variables. Presidents from colleges **with** bargaining gave significantly higher ratings to *professional staff salaries* and *physical facilities* (Tables 50 and 51) than presidents from colleges **without** bargaining. The reverse was true for *community support of education* and *student morale* (Tables 52 and 53). Those from colleges **without** negotiations rated their colleges higher (outstanding) on these two variables.

## Administrative Roles and Functions – Part IV

### Importance Ratings

The following thirteen (13) administrative roles and functions were rated in terms of importance on a 5-point scale from "very important" to "unimportant":

1. General decision making
2. Building management
3. Business management
4. Establishment of educational goals
5. Budgeting
6. Personnel selection, assignment, retention and promotion
7. Staff evaluation
8. Curriculum planning
9. Stimulating innovation and change
10. Supervision of instruction
11. Coordinating school activities
12. Policy development and implementation
13. Student discipline

Administrators from schools/districts/colleges with collective bargaining were also to report the effects of staff negotiations on a three-point scale – "strengthened," "no effect" and "weakened" ratings.

The results of the importance ratings show wide variations between the three groups on the perceived importance of various administrative roles and functions (Table 6). These differences tended to correlate with the traditional responsibilities associated with the positions.

The administrative role or function with consistent responses across groups was *personnel selection, assignment, retention and promotion.* Nearly all respondents rated this item as "very important" or "relatively important." All other items showed a significant disparity between one group and the other two. Typically, the principal or community college president groups deviated from the others. Superintendents tended to respond like one of the other groups on nearly all items.

Virtually all roles and functions were rated, by a large majority within each group, as being either "very important" or "relatively important." The differences arose in the respondents' ratings within these two categories.

Principals rated as less important (relative to the other two groups) (a) *general decision making,* (b) *business management,* (c) *budgeting* and (d) *policy development and implementation.* They (principals) rated as more important (a) *staff evaluation,* (b) *curriculum planning* and (c) *supervision of instruction* (Tables 54 through 60).

Community college presidents rated less important (relative to principals and superintendents) *building management, supervision of instruction* and *building management* Tables 60 and 61). They rated as more important *establishing goals and priorities* and *stimulating innovation and change* (Tables 62 and 63).

Except for *business management* (Table 55), which was rated more highly, superintendents' responses were in the range between principals' and community college presidents' responses. On one item, *student discipline,* (which only principals and superintendents rated) superintendents rated the function as being of less importance than that perceived by principals (Table 6).

## Effects of Collective Bargaining

The survey groups were instructed to report the effects of collective bargaining on each of the thirteen administrative roles and functions. The same three response options – "strengthened," "no effect" and "weakened" – as provided for rating the institutional variables – were used in this section of the survey instruments.

Majorities of each of the three groups perceived either "weakened" or "no effects" on the roles and functions. None of the thirteen roles and functions was viewed by anything close to a majority as having been "strengthened" by teacher collective bargaining.

Those roles and functions perceived by the largest proportions of all three groups as "weakened" by teacher bargaining were *general decision making, personnel selection, assignment, retention and promotion* and *budgeting* (Table 6). The other ten roles and functions were considered by most respondents as having been largely unaffected by collective bargaining.

There were some large differences between the three groups in their "effects" responses. Statistically significant response patterns were observed for eight of the thirteen administrative roles and functions. Community college presidents were responsible for all but one of the among-groups differences. Significantly smaller proportions of community college presidents reported "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on *general decision-making* and *building management* (Tables 64 and 65). They (community college presidents) perceived much more "weakened" effects, however, on *establishing educational goals and priorities, staff evaluation, curriculum planning, stimulating innovation and change* and *supervision of instruction* (Tables 66 through 70).

Principals responded in a statistically different way on only one role and function – *business management* (Table 71). A smaller proportion of principals than superintendents and college presidents perceived "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on this variable.

## Organizational Variables

Size. Organizational size was not a major influencing variable in the importance ratings of administrative roles and functions. Only three variables were rated in significantly different ways and in all cases the differences were within the principals' group. Principals from large schools rated (a) *supervision of instruction,* (b) *stimulating innovation and change* and (c) *establishment of educational goals and priorities* significantly higher (important) than those from smaller schools (Tables 72 through 74).

On one variable the "effects of negotiations" rating was different among schools of varying size. Superintendents from large districts perceived more "weakened" effects of teacher bargaining on *stimulating innovation and change* than superintendents from small districts (Table 75).

Control of organization. The control (public vs non-public) of the organization apparently had little influence on perceptions of the importance of administrative roles and functions or the effects of collective bargaining on administrative roles and functions. One variable – *building management* – was rated differently by public and non-public principals. The public school group gave a significantly higher (important) rating to this role and function than the non-public sample.

No significant differences in the "effects of collective bargaining" ratings on the organizational control variable were observed for any of the administrative roles and functions.

Years engaged in collective bargaining. A single administrative role and function was rated differently on the basis of years engaged in collective bargaining. Community college presidents from colleges which had provided teacher bargaining for over six years, perceived more "weakened" effects of collective bargaining on *stimulating innovation and change* than presidents from colleges with less experience in negotiations (Table 77).

Collective bargaining – with and without. The only significant difference between administrators from organizations with and those **without** teacher bargaining was for the administrative role or function – *supervision of instruction* (Table 78). Community college presidents from colleges **with** bargaining rated this role or function more highly (important) than presidents from colleges **without** teacher negotiations.

## Problems and Issues – Part V

### Severity Ratings

Part V of the instrument surveyed the perceptions of administrators toward Problems and Issues in Education. Three areas were investigated: (a) severity or magnitude of the problems and issues, (b) the future projection of severity of the problems and issues and (c) the effects of collective bargaining on the problems and issues. The severity or magnitude of the following 19 problems and issues were rated on a five-point scale from "very critical" to "not a problem or issue":

1. School/community relations
2. Excessive paperwork
3. Problems of teacher personnel
4. Developing and enforcing policies
5. Desegregation–integration
6. Problems of pupil personnel
7. Student discipline control
8. Drug and alcohol abuse
9. Teacher militancy
10. Accountability demands
11. Job security
12. Declining enrollments
13. Loss of local control
14. Implementing affirmative action
15. Student attendance
16. Problems related to controlling board
17. Increasing educational costs
18. Decreasing revenues
19. Working conditions for professional staff

Future projection of severity ratings also used a five-point scale extending from "become much more critical" to "become much less critical."

Those problems and issues viewed as most serious were (a) *school community relations,* (b) *problems of teacher personnel,* (c) *developing and enforcing policies and regulations,*

(d) *accountability demands,* (e) *student attendance* (by principals only), (f) *increasing costs* and (g) *decreasing revenues.* The last two, *increasing costs* and *decreasing revenues,* were rated by more respondents as being "very critical" than any of the other 17 items (Table 7).

Larger proportions of superintendents and principals rated the problems and issues as more "serious" and "important" than community college presidents. Those problems and issues receiving the least serious ratings by the three groups were (a) *declining enrollments,* (b) *implementing affirmative action,* (c) *staff communications,* (d) *working conditions,* (e) *desegregation-integration* and (f) *problems of pupil personnel* (Table 7).

The future projection of severity of the problems and issues tended to correlate positively with the present severity ratings. The problems and issues were generally perceived as becoming more serious than they are at present. Those problems and issues projected as becoming "much more critical" were (a) *school community relations,* (b) *paper work,* (c) *problems of teacher personnel,* (d) *developing and enforcing policies and regulations,* (e) *teacher militancy,* (f) *accountability demands,* (g) *salaries and fringe benefits,* (h) *extra curricular programs,* (i) *problems related to the controlling board* and (j) *working conditions.* Leading the list as most critical in the future were the same two that were rated as presently most serious — (a) *increasing educational costs* and (b) *decreasing revenues* (Table 7).

Minor changes from present to future ratings were noted on the following educational problems and issues: (a) *desegregation-integration,* (b) *problems of pupil personnel,* (c) *student discipline,* (d) *drug and alcohol abuse,* (e) *affirmative action,* (f) *student attendance,* (g) *staff communications,* (h) *problems related to the controlling board* and (i) *working conditions* (Table 7). It should be repeated, however, that in nearly every case, these problems and issues were seen as becoming more serious than they are perceived at present.

## Effects of Collective Bargaining

The nineteen problems and issues common to schools and community colleges were rated by respondents as having been positively, detrimentally or not affected by teacher collective bargaining. Eight of the 19 problems and issues were rated by a majority or near majority of subjects in all three groups as having been detrimentally affected by collective bargaining. In the order of the highest proportions responding in the "detrimental effect" column were *increasing educational costs, teacher militancy, problems of teacher personnel, school/community relations, decreasing revenues, developing and enforcing policies and regulations, loss of local control* and *problems related to controlling board* (Table 7).

One issue — *working conditions for professional staff* — received a "positive effect" rating by the survey groups. The remaining ten problems and issues were generally perceived as unaffected by teacher collective bargaining. Those considered least affected were *drug and*

*alcohol abuse, problems of pupil personnel, desegregation-integration, student discipline control, declining enrollments, implementing affirmative action* and *student attendance* (Table 7). A majority of respondents in each of the three survey groups gave "no effects" ratings to these items.

The analyses of differences among the survey groups produced six statistically different response patterns. Community college presidents were responsible for two of the differences, principals for two, and superintendents accounted for the other two. Larger proportions of community college presidents than principals and superintendents reported "detrimental effects" of teacher bargaining on *excessive paperwork* and *implementing affirmative action* (Tables 79 and 80).

Although most principals perceived detrimental effects of collective bargaining on *increasing educational costs* (69%), the proportion was significantly lower than those of superintendents and community college presidents (Table 81). Principals were also significantly different on their ratings of the effects of teacher bargaining on *working conditions for professional staff* (Table 82). Exactly half of the principals' group rated positive effects of collective bargaining on this variable as compared to 33% and 40% respectively for superintendents and community college presidents.

None of the groups was in close agreement on two of the problems and issues – *job security* and *loss of local control* (Tables 83 and 84). Larger proportions of superintendents rated both variables as detrimentally affected by collective bargaining.

## Organizational Variables

Size. Size of organization produced nine significant within-groups differences on six educational problems and issues variables. Principals accounted for one difference. Those from large schools rated *desegregation-integration* as a more serious problem than did principals from small schools (Table 85).

Superintendents responded differently, on the basis of size of organization, on six variables. Four of the six differences were on severity ratings, with large district superintendents perceiving the educational problems and issues as more serious than their small district counterparts. The four variables were (a) *student discipline control*, (b) *teacher militancy*, (c) *declining enrollments* and (d) *desegregation-integration* (Tables 86 through 89). Superintendents from large districts perceived significantly more problems in the future for *desegregation-integration* and *problems of pupil personnel* than those from small districts (Tables 90 and 91).

Superintendents from various sized districts rated the "effects of negotiations" differently on one educational problem and issue – *accountability demands* (Table 92). Large district superintendents perceived more "detrimental effects" of collective bargaining on this issue than did small district superintendents.

Community college presidents differed on the size variable on one severity rating – *declining enrollments* (Table 93). Small college presidents perceived *declining enrollments* as a significantly more serious problem than presidents from large colleges.

Control of organization. In the analyses of within-groups differences on the control of organization variable, superintendents were not included because only one non-public superintendent responded to the survey. No "effects of negotiations" on collective bargaining analyses were performed on the principals' group because none of the non-public principals worked in schools with teacher bargaining.

Principals in public and non-public schools accounted for eight significant differences in severity and projected future severity ratings of problems and issues in education. *Student attendance, loss of local control* and *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* were rated by public school principals as (a) presently more serious and (b) projected in the future to be more serious problems and issues than did non-public principals (Tables 94 through 99). *Drug and alcohol abuse* and *teacher militancy* were also rated as significantly more serious problems or issues at present by public school principals than by non-public principals (Tables 100 and 101).

Community college presidents from state, local and private schools differed in their ratings of problems and issues in education on five variables. Private college presidents rated as significantly less serious, relative to state and local presidents, *loss of local control* and *problems of teacher personnel* (Tables 102 and 103). Presidents from locally controlled colleges perceived a more serious threat to local control in the future than state and private college presidents.

The "effects of collective bargaining" were viewed differently by community college presidents on two variables – *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* and *problems related to board of education* (Tables 104 and 105). In both cases, presidents from locally controlled colleges perceived more "detrimental effects" of teacher bargaining than did presidents from state and privately controlled colleges.

Years engaged in collective bargaining. Four problems and issues in education received significantly different ratings from administrator groups on the basis of years engaged in collective bargaining. Principals differed on one variable – *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* (Table 106). Principals from schools with less experience perceived the problem as becoming more serious in the future and also rated more "detrimental" effects of collective bargaining than those principals from districts with more years of involvement in bargaining (Table 107).

Superintendents and community college presidents working in institutions with six or more years of collective bargaining for teachers rated three problems and issues as more serious than their counterparts in colleges and districts with less experience in negotiations. The more years engaged in bargaining, the more serious the ratings of *problems of pupil personnel* and *school/community relations* by superintendents (Tables 108 and 109). *Job security* was rated as a more severe problem by community college presidents in colleges with six or more years of bargaining than by presidents from schools with fewer years of bargaining (Table 110).

Collective bargaining – with and without. Nearly all of the significant differences in ratings for those who have collective bargaining and those who do not were within the principals group. Principals from schools **with** teacher bargaining rated the following problems and issues as more severe than those from schools **without** collective bargaining: (a) *problems of pupil personnel,* (b) *job security,* (c) *drug and alcohol abuse,* (d) *declining enrollments,* (e) *problems related to board of education,* (f) *loss of local control,* (g) *student discipline control,* (h) *teacher militancy,* (i) *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* (Tables 111 through 119).

Five problems and issues were rated as significantly different in terms of future severity. Principals working in schools **with** teacher bargaining rated projected severity significantly higher (more severe) than principals from schools **without** teacher bargaining on the following: (a) *student discipline control,* (b) *teacher militancy,* (c) *developing and enforcing policies and regulations,* (d) *implementing affirmative action,* (e) *accountability demands* (Tables 120 through 124).

Two significant differences in severity ratings existed within the community college presidents group. Those presidents from colleges **with** bargaining gave higher severity ratings to *job security* and *developing and enforcing policies and regulations* than did presidents from colleges **without** teacher bargaining (Tables 125 and 126).

## DISCUSSION

The questions in the General Impressions section of the survey produced an interesting response pattern. Principals and superintendents tended to respond in a like manner. Community college presidents, on the other hand, responded differently. On all items, the presidents agreed less strongly than the other two groups. Perhaps this response pattern can be partially attributed to the prevalence of collective bargaining among the three samples. Three-fourths of the principals and superintendents responding to the survey were from schools or districts with collective bargaining while only one-half of the community college presidents were from colleges with teacher bargaining.

The results of Part II indicate rather clearly that all three groups perceived a significant impact of collective bargaining on education and on administrative roles. That impact was typically viewed as negative and detrimental to the administrator, regardless of level. There was general consensus on the role of professional associations and organizations in the collective bargaining issue. All three groups tended to agree that their associations were sensitive to the implications of collective bargaining and were keeping their members current on collective bargaining issues.

The results of Part III also showed some significant variations between groups on both institutional quality ratings and the effects of collective bargaining on the institutional variables. Once again, community college presidents tended to differ from the principal and superintendent groups. Their ratings were higher than those made by the other two groups. In general, however, the administrative groups rated their respective institutions fairly high on all 13 institutional quality variables. On only one variable – *inservice programs* – did a majority of all three groups rate their schools/districts/colleges as fair or poor.

The perceptions of effects of collective bargaining revealed a rather negative view of the impact of collective bargaining on the institutional variables. Collective bargaining was seen by a majority of respondents as having a positive (strengthening) effect on *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits* only. The typical result was either "no effect" or "weakening" effects. On *community support, staff morale, public relations* and *fiscal condition* collective bargaining was perceived by most respondents as having had a "weakened" effect. The importance of these variables to an educational institution cannot be over emphasized. If the effects of collective bargaining are as profound as reported, educational institutions will experience increasingly serious problems as collective bargaining with teachers becomes more prevalent throughout the country.

Minimal effects of collective bargaining were perceived for *instructional programs, student achievement* and *student morale.* The respondents tended to see "no effects" of collective bargaining on these variables. This suggests that the differences between teacher organizations and boards of control may not be affecting teaching performance or student learning to any appreciable degree. If there are significant strengthening or weakening effects on these variables, they are not apparent to a majority of administrators.

The organizational variables of size, control, years engaged in collective bargaining and bargaining versus no-bargaining resulted in some meaningful differences on the institutional quality and effects ratings. The two quality variables – *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits for professional staff* – were rated differently on all institutional variables by at least one of the three administrator groups. Administrators from large, public institutions, which have provided collective bargaining for a long period of time, rated salaries and fringe benefits as more "outstanding" or "good" than administrators from institutions with opposite characteristics.

The only significant differences in ratings of the effects of collective bargaining for the institutional quality variables were on the years engaged in collective bargaining. Two of the three differences were *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits.* Not surprisingly, the longer the organization was involved in collective bargaining, the more "strengthened" the perceived effects of bargaining. *Staff morale,* however, was seen as more "weakened" by principals from schools with less experience in bargaining.

Administrators working in schools/districts/colleges with collective bargaining rated their respective institutions significantly different on several quality variables. Except for *staff salaries* and *fringe benefits* (which those with bargaining rated higher), administrators without bargaining tended to provide significantly higher (outstanding) institutional quality ratings. For some undiscernible reason, principals differed most frequently.

The importance ratings of the thirteen Administrative Roles and Functions produced no unusual results. All roles and functions were rated as important by a majority of respondents with some slight variations in degrees of importance. The three groups varied significantly in their ratings and generally these differences correlated with the frequency with which administrators perform the roles and functions.

The effects of collective bargaining on administrative roles and functions were rather distressing. No "strengthening" effects were seen by a majority of respondents on any of the roles and functions. Administrators in all three groups either saw "no effects" or "weakening" effects of collective bargaining. As with the importance ratings, the groups varied markedly in their effects ratings. Usually, the more important the rating assigned to a role or function by a given group, the greater the perceived "weakening effects" of collective bargaining.

Size, organization control, and years engaged in collective bargaining variables resulted in few significant within-groups differences for the thirteen administrative roles and functions. Principals accounted for the size and control of organization differences, with large public school principals rating several roles and functions as more important than small school principals.

The only differences in "effects of collective bargaining" ratings were on size and years engaged in bargaining. Large school principals saw significantly more "weakened" effects of bargaining on *stimulating innovation and change* than principals from small schools. Presidents from community colleges with long experience in bargaining rated the same role or function – *stimulating innovation and change* – as more "weakened" by collective bargaining than presidents in colleges with less experience. No explanations for these differences in "effects of collective bargaining" ratings are offered.

Administrators from institutions with and those without bargaining were in surprising agreement on the importance ratings of administrative roles and functions. Only one difference was observed – *supervision of instruction*. College presidents from colleges with bargaining rated *supervision of instruction* higher (more important) than those presidents without bargaining in their colleges.

Problems and Issues in Education were rated relative to present severity, projected severity (5-10 years in the future) and effects of negotiations. The typical response pattern was one in which administrators rated problems as becoming more serious five to ten years from now. Problems related to school financial support were seen as most "detrimentally" affected by collective bargaining. The number of current problems seen as being aggravated by collective bargaining were numerous. A few problems and issues were perceived as being neither positively nor negatively effected by collective bargaining. Only one – *salaries and fringe benefits* – was seen as having been "positively" effected by bargaining.

The results of Part V – Problems and Issues in Education – were significant in several ways. Administrators have a pessimistic view of the future with respect to the problems and issues of major concern to them today. Very few respondents in any of the three groups saw possibilities for improvement in the magnitude of the problems. The second area of concern is the prevailing negativism associated with collective bargaining. Whether their perceptions are accurate or not, administrators see many more ill-effects resulting from collective bargaining than good. This comes at a time when collective bargaining is becoming more prevalent at all levels of education and when teacher organizations are more vocal and demanding than ever before.

The organizational variables (size, control, years in collective bargaining, bargaining-with and without) analyses produced numerous differences on the problems and issues ratings. Large school/district/college administrators tended to perceive the problems and issues as more severe, becoming more severe in the future and more detrimentally affected by teacher bargaining than administrators from small institutions. One exception was the severity rating on *declining enrollments* by community college presidents. Presidents of small colleges saw this as a more serious problem than presidents from large colleges.

The control of organization analyses among principals resulted in eight significant differences. In all cases, public school principals rated the problems or issues as more severe or becoming more severe in the future than non-public school principals.

There was a tendency for administrators from institutions with more experience in collective bargaining to rate the problems and issues as more severe than those from schools/districts and colleges with little experience in bargaining.

Principals from schools **with** and **without** bargaining were different on most of the educational problems and issues. In virtually every case, principals from schools **with** teacher bargaining rated the problems or issues as presently more severe or projected to become more severe in the future.

Although fewer in number, the differences within the community college presidents group were the same as for principals. Presidents from colleges **with** bargaining gave higher severity ratings to the educational problems and issues than those from colleges **without** bargaining.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF THE STUDY

### A Congruence of Results on the Effects of Collective Bargaining

The most encouraging findings of this study were the perceived minimal effects of collective bargaining on students and programs. There was general consensus among the survey groups that teacher bargaining had "no effect" on *instructional programs, student achievement, extra-curricular programs* and *student morale.*

Several of the serious student-related problems in education have apparently not been affected to any significant degree by collective bargaining. Most respondents reported "no effects" of bargaining on *student discipline control* (principals and superintendents only completed this item), *student attendance, drug and alcohol abuse* (principals and superintendents only), and other student-related problems.

The positive or beneficial effects of collective bargaining appear to have accrued to teachers. Majorities of respondents from all three groups agreed that collective bargaining has improved teacher salaries, fringe benefits and working conditions.

While these improvements in working conditions and economic issues are acknowledged as substantial, most administrators feel that a heavy price has been paid for these gains. The most serious negative consequences of collective bargaining were seen in the matters related to community, staff and finance. Collective bargaining has weakened *staff morale*, increased *problems of teacher personnel* and promoted *teacher militancy. School/community relations* and *community support of education* were seen as seriously affected by teacher bargaining.

Collective bargaining was perceived as having its greatest negative impact on variables related to finance. Four items of the survey addressed the finance issue — *fiscal condition, budgeting, decreasing revenues* and *increasing costs.*

Of the 13 Institutional Quality variables rated by respondents, *fiscal condition* was considered by the largest proportions of administrators to have been "weakened" by collective bargaining. Majorities of superintendents and community college presidents perceived "weakened" effects on the *budgeting* function. Principals, whose role in budgeting is minimal in comparison to superintendents and community college presidents, tended to view "no effects."

In the opinion of school administrators, the problems most detrimentally affected by collective bargaining were *increasing costs* and *decreasing revenues.* Overall, between two-thirds and four-fifths of all administrators perceived "detrimental" effects of collective bargaining on these two finance-related variables.

## A Contrast of Results on the Effects of Collective Bargaining

There was a sizable number of statistically significant differences in response patterns among the three survey groups. These differences did not, however, change the general conclusions of this study.

Only five of the differences observed produced response patterns in which less than a majority of at least one group and a majority of at least one other group selected the same response option, e.g., less than half of group A perceived "weakened" effects while more than half of groups B and C perceived "weakened" effects. The five items to receive these significantly different response patterns were (a) *staff evaluation,* (b) *stimulating innovation and change,* (c) *supervision of instruction,* (d) *job security,* and (e) *loss of local control.*

The first three items – *staff evaluation, stimulating innovation and change* and *supervision of instruction* – were rated by less than half of the principals and superintendents, but by more than half of the community college presidents as "weakened" by collective bargaining. *Job security* was perceived as detrimentally affected by a majority of superintendents, but by less than a majority of principals and community college presidents. The fifth item – *loss of local control* – was rated as detrimentally affected by less than half of the principals group but by majorities of superintendents and community college presidents.

The differences involving community college presidents are difficult to interpret. College presidents are probably less involved in direct *staff evaluation* and *supervision of instruction* than either principals or superintendents and yet they perceived far greater "weakened" effects than either of these two groups. *Stimulating innovation and change,* an administrative role of equal importance to all three groups, was also perceived by a much larger proportion of community college presidents as "weakened" by teacher bargaining. No explanations for these differences are offered.

A majority of superintendents rated *job security* as detrimentally affected by collective bargaining, but less than half of either of the other groups responded in this way. This finding might be explained by the fact that, in general, *job security* is a more pressing problem for superintendents. Collective bargaining is one of the more important issues superintendents must deal with and would, therefore, pose a threat to *job security* if not handled to the satisfaction of the controlling body.

*Loss of local control,* perceived by less than half the principals' group as a problem detrimentally affected by collective bargaining, may be explained by the limited roles and responsibilities of the principal. His/her involvement with controlling boards and knowledge of threats to their control would be minimal. The principal's basic responsibility is the day-to-day operation of a school and he/she may not be cognizant of infringements on local control by special interest groups, state and federal agencies or teacher unions.

As mentioned previously, these differences do not change the substantive results of the study. There were no differences in perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining on issues related to finance, staff salaries, fringe benefits, working conditions, school/community relations, students, and instructional programs.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This investigation focused on two basic areas: (a) administrators' **ratings** of their institutions, job roles and functions and the salient problems and issues in education now and in the future; (b) the perceived **effects** of collective bargaining on schools and colleges, administrative roles and functions and educational problems and issues.

The results of the study were at the same time both encouraging and distressing. Administrators at all three levels gave high marks to their schools and colleges on important quality variables. Collective bargaining, while perceived as having profound negative effects on many facets of the educational enterprise, has apparently had minimal impact on students or instructional programs.

Administrators perceive far more negative effects associated with collective bargaining than positive. The only positive effects of collective bargaining, in the opinion of administrators, have accrued to teachers in the form of staff salaries, fringe benefits and working conditions.

The perceived negative/detrimental effects of collective bargaining were most strongly felt in areas related to school finance, school/community relations and staff morale.

A rather disturbing finding of the study was with respect to the perceptions of problems and issues now and in the future. Administrators have a pessimistic view of the future in that they see the problems in education as becoming much more serious five to ten years from now.

Below is a summary of the ratings of institutional quality, administrative roles and functions and problems and issues in education:

* All groups tended to rate their institutions high on quality variables with community college presidents giving higher quality ratings to their institutions than either principals or superintendents.

* Inservice programs was the only quality variable rated by more than half of all groups as "fair" or "poor." All other variables were rated by majorities as "excellent" or "good."

* Large, public funded schools with long experience in collective bargaining are perceived as having better salaries and fringe benefits.

* Except for the two variables – salaries and fringe benefits – administrators from schools and colleges **without** teacher bargaining gave better ratings on the quality variables than those **with** bargaining.

* Administrators from large, public funded schools and colleges with long years of experience in collective bargaining tended to perceive problems and issues as more serious now and becoming more serious in the future than small, private schools and colleges with less experience in bargaining.

* Principals and community college presidents from schools and colleges **with** teacher bargaining rated problems and issues as presently more severe and projected to become more severe than their counterparts in schools/colleges **without** teacher bargaining.

The following results and conclusions are drawn from the ratings of the **effects of collective bargaining** on institutional quality variables, administrative roles and functions and problems and issues in education:

* Teacher collective bargaining has had a perceived positive effect on three variables only – *staff salaries, fringe benefits* and *working conditions.* All other variables were felt to be either unaffected or "weakened" by collective bargaining.

* Collective bargaining was perceived as having only minimal impact on *student achievement, instructional programs,* and *student morale.*

* In the opinion of school and community college administrators, the conflicts involving teacher organizations and board of control have apparently not affected teaching performance or student-teacher relations to any appreciable degree.

* No administrative roles and functions were believed to be strengthened by collective bargaining. Typically, the more important the administrative role or function the greater the reported "weakened effects" of collective bargaining.

* The most serious and detrimental effects of collective bargaining were related to financial issues – *increasing costs, decreasing revenues, budgeting* and *fiscal condition.*

* Administrators believe there has been a deterioration of school/community relations as the public becomes disenchanted with a perceived "higher cost, lower return" on the dollar spent for education.

The results of this investigation suggest that an "is-ought" dichotomy exists in the arena of collective bargaining. Proponents of collective bargaining claim that the process improves the educational enterprise and its absence has a negative effect. Apparently the process has either a neutral or, in some instances, a deleterious effect on the enterprise. These data are of a "threshold" nature as it relates to the substance of bargaining. If bargaining demands are such that they affect the quality of public support and/or the educational process, then these elements are germane to the elements of negotiations. To make demands to demonstrate "teaching power" is a step away from the intellectual and humanistic character of education as it has been perceived in the past.

# APPENDIX

## COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SURVEY
## NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS

### Part I – Background Information

1. Check which of the following describes your present position:

   (a) Superintendent _____ (b) Principal of a Secondary School _____

2. Number of years in your present position (including this year): _____

3. Grade level organization:

   (a) If superintendent, district organization –
   K–12 _____ 9–12 _____ 9–14 _____
   K– 6 _____ 7–12 _____ 7–14 _____
   K–14 _____ Other _____

   (b) If principal, school organization –
   9–12 _____ 9–10 _____ 10–12 _____
   11–12 _____ 9–14 _____ 10–14 _____ Other _____

4. Control of district or school: Public _____ Non-Public _____

5. General type of district or school: Urban _____ Suburban _____ Town _____ Rural _____

6. Size of school or district (student enrollment):

   (a) Superintendents – Under 400 _____ (b) Principals – Under 400 _____
   400-5000 _____ 400-1000 _____
   5000-15000 _____ 1000-2000 _____
   over 15000 _____ over 2000 _____

7. Does your district engage in collective bargaining with teachers? Yes _____ No _____

   (a) If "yes" to 7 above, number of years (including this year). _____
   (b) If "yes" to 7 above, indicate the national affiliation of your local bargaining group.
   National Education Association _____ American Federation of Teachers (AFL/CIO) _____

   Other (please list) _____

8. Do secondary school principals in your district participate in the collective bargaining process?
   Yes _____ No _____
   (a) If "yes" to 8 above, what is their role in negotiations?
   Active involvement _____ Silent observers _____

   Other (please list) _____

### Part II – General Impressions

Directions: For questions 9-15, please circle the number after each item which correlates to your response

| Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree that: | Agree Strongly | Agree | Agree Mildly | Disagree Mildly | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. Collective bargaining with teachers is becoming more prevalent in the schools. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. National professional education associations and organizations are aware of the implications of collective bargaining on the administration of schools (e.g., North Central Association, Phi Delta Kappa, American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Secondary School Principals, etc.). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| | | Agree Strongly | Agree | Agree Mildly | Disagree Mildly | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. | National professional education associations and organizations are doing a good job of keeping their members abreast of collective bargaining issues. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. | The school administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. | The superintendent/principal (respond for your position only) should be actively involved in the teacher negotiations process. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. | Collective bargaining has forced administrators to share administrative decision-making with teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. | Collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities given to superintendents/principals (respond for your position only). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

## Part III — Institutional Ratings

Please rate your school or district on the following variables. If your district provides collective bargaining for teachers, please indicate your perceptions of the effects of staff negotiations on each of the variables listed.

| | | Rating | | | | Effects of Staff Negotiations* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Outstanding | Good | Fair | Poor | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 16. | Instructional program | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 17. | Extra-curricular programs | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 18. | Community support of education | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 19. | Staff morale | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 20. | Inservice programs | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 21. | Student academic achievement | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 22. | Student morale | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 23. | Intra-staff communications | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 24. | Public relations | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 25. | Professional staff salaries | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 26. | Fringe benefits for professional staff | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 27. | Physical facilities | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 28. | Fiscal condition | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

*Complete only if your school provides for collective bargaining.

## Part IV – Administrative Roles and Functions

INSTRUCTION: Below are listed some of the major roles and functions of school administrators. Please rate these roles and functions in terms of perceived IMPORTANCE. If your district provides collective bargaining for teachers, please indicate your perceptions of the effects of staff negotiations on your ability to perform each of the administrative roles or functions.

| | | Importance Rating | | | | | Effects of Staff Negotiations* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Important | Relatively Important | Neutral | Relatively Unimportant | Unimportant | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 29. | General decision making | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 30. | Building management | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 31. | Business management | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 32. | Establishment of educational goals and priorities | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 33. | Budgeting | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 34. | Personnel selection, assignment, retention & promotion | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 35. | Staff evaluation | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 36. | Curriculum planning | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 37. | Stimulating innovation & change | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 38. | Supervision of instruction | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 39. | Coordinating school activities | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 40. | Policy development & implementation | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 41. | Student discipline | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

*Complete only if your school provides for collective bargaining.

## Part V – Problems and Issues in Education

Below are listed some issues and problems confronting educational administrators. Please rate in terms of (a) severity or magnitude, (b) estimate of severity or magnitude in the future (five to ten years hence). If your district engages in collective bargaining with teachers, please indicate the effects of staff negotiations on each of the issues and problems listed.

| | | Severity or Magnitude | | | | | Future Projection | | | | | Negotiations* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Critical Problem or Issue | Important Problem or Issue | Occasional Problem or Issue | Minor Problem or Issue | Not a Present Problem or Issue | Become Much More Critical | Become Slightly More Critical | No Change | Become Slightly Less Critical | Become Much Less Critical | Positive Effect | No Effect | Detrimental Effect |
| 42. | School/community relations | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 43. | Excessive paper work | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 44. | Problems of teacher personnel | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 45. | Developing and enforcing policies & regulations | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

| | | Severity or Magnitude | | | | | Future Projection | | | | | Negotiations* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Critical Problem or Issue | Important Problem or Issue | Occasional Problem or Issue | Minor Problem or Issue | Not a Present Problem or Issue | Become Much More Critical | Become Slightly More Critical | No Change | Become Slightly Less Critical | Become Much Less Critical | Positive Effect | No Effect | Detrimental Effect |
| 46. | Desegregation – integration | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 47. | Problems of pupil personnel | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 48. | Student discipline control | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 49. | Drug and alcohol abuse | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 50. | Teacher militancy | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 51. | Accountability demands | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 52. | Job security | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 53. | Professional staff salaries | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 54. | Declining enrollments | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 55. | Loss of local control | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 56. | Implementing affirmative action | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 57. | Extra-curricular programs | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 58. | Student attendance | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 59. | Intra-staff communications | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 60. | Problems related to board of education | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 61. | Increasing educational costs | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 62. | Decreasing revenues | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 63. | Working conditions for professional staff | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

## COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SURVEY -- NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

### Part I – Background Information

1. Control of your college: State _____ State/Local _____ Non-public _____

2. General type(s) of area served: Urban _____ Suburban _____ Town _____ Rural _____

3. Size of your college (student enrollment):

   under 500 _____
   500–1000 _____
   1000–3000 _____
   3000–5000 _____
   over 5000 _____

4. Do you have a collective bargaining agreement with your instructional staff? Yes _____ No _____

   (a) If "yes" to 4 above, number of years (including this year). _____
   (b) If "yes" to 4 above, indicate the national affiliation of your local bargaining group.
   National Education Association _____
   American Federation of Teachers (AFL/CIO) _____
   American Association of University Professors _____

   Other (please list) _____

5. Do administrators or Board Members at your college participate in collective bargaining sessions?
   Yes _____ No _____
   (a) If "yes" to 5 above, what is their role in negotiations?
   Active involvement _____ Silent observers _____

   Other (please list) _____

### Part II – General Impressions

Directions: For questions 6-11 please circle the number after each item which correlates to your response.

| Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree that: | Agree Strongly | Agree | Agree Mildly | Disagree Mildly | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Collective bargaining with teachers is becoming more prevalent in community and junior colleges. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. National professional education associations and organizations are aware of the implications of collective bargaining on the administration of colleges (e.g., North Central Association, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, American Council on Education, Phi Delta Kappa, etc.). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. National professional education associations and organizations are doing a good job of keeping their members abreast of collective bargaining issues. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. The college administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. Collective bargaining has forced community and junior college presidents to share administrative decision making with teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. Collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities given to community and junior college presidents. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

## Part III – Institutional Ratings

Please rate your college on the following variables. If your college provides collective bargaining for teachers, please indicate your perceptions of the effects of staff negotiations on each of the variables listed.

| | | RATING | | | | EFFECTS OF STAFF NEGOTIATIONS* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Outstanding | Good | Fair | Poor | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 12. | Instructional program | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 13. | Extra-curricular programs | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 14. | Community support of education | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 15. | Staff morale | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 16. | Inservice programs | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 17. | Student academic achievement | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 18. | Student morale | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 19. | Intra-staff communications | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 20. | Public relations | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 21. | Professional staff salaries | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 22. | Fringe benefits for professional staff | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 23. | Physical facilities | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 24. | Fiscal condition | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

*Complete only if your college provides for collective bargaining.

## Part IV – Administrative Roles and Functions

INSTRUCTION: Below are listed some of the major roles and functions of college administrators. Please rate in terms of perceived IMPORTANCE of each role or function. If your college provides collective bargaining for teachers, please indicate your perceptions of the effects of staff negotiations on your ability to perform each of the administrative roles or functions.

| | | IMPORTANCE RATING | | | | | EFFECTS OF STAFF NEGOTIATIONS* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Important | Relatively Important | Neutral | Relatively Unimportant | Unimportant | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 25. | General decision making | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 26. | Building management | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 27. | Business management | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 28. | Establishment of educational goals and priorities | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

| | | IMPORTANCE RATING | | | | | EFFECTS OF STAFF NEGOTIATIONS* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Important | Relatively Important | Neutral | Relatively Unimportant | Unimportant | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 29. | Budgeting | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 30. | Personnel selection, assignment, retention and promotion | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 31. | Staff evaluation | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 32. | Curriculum planning | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 33. | Stimulating innovation and change | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 34. | Supervision of instruction | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 35. | Coordinating school activities | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 36. | Policy development and implementation | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

*Complete only if your college provides for collective bargaining.

## Part V – Problems and Issues in Education

Below are listed some issues and problems confronting college administrators. Please rate in terms of (a) severity or magnitude, (b) estimate of magnitude or severity in the future (five to ten years hence). If your college engages in collective bargaining with teachers, please indicate the effects of staff negotiations on each of the issues and problems listed.

| | | SEVERITY OR MAGNITUDE | | | | | FUTURE PROJECTION | | | | | NEGOTIATIONS* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Critical Problem or Issue | Important Problem or Issue | Occasional Problem or Issue | Minor Problem or Issue | Not a Present Problem or Issue | Become Much More Critical | Become Slightly More Critical | No Change | Become Slightly Less Critical | Become Much Less Critical | Positive Effect | No Effect | Detrimental Effect |
| 37. | School/community relations | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 38. | Excessive paperwork | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 39. | Problems of teacher personnel | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 40. | Developing and enforcing policies and regulations | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 41. | Problems of pupil personnel | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 42. | Teacher militancy | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 43. | Accountability demands | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 44. | Job security | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 45. | Professional staff salaries and fringe benefits | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 46. | Declining enrollments | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

| | | SEVERITY OR MAGNITUDE | | | | | FUTURE PROJECTION | | | | | NEGOTIATIONS* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Very Critical Problem or Issue | Important Problem or Issue | Occasional Problem or Issue | Minor Problem or Issue | Not a Present Problem or Issue | Become Much More Critical | Become Slightly More Critical | No Change | Become Slightly Less Critical | Become Much Less Critical | Positive Effect | No Effect | Detrimental Effect |
| 47. | Loss of local control | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 48. | Implementing affirmative action | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 49. | Extra-curricular programs | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 50. | Intra-staff communications | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 51. | Problems related to the controlling board | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 52. | Increasing educational costs | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 53. | Decreasing revenues | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |
| 54. | Working conditions for professional staff | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5) | (1 | 2 | 3) |

*Complete only if your college provides for collective bargaining.

TABLE 1

PART I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION — SURVEY GROUP: PRINCIPALS

| 1. School level organization: | | n | % | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 9-12 | 120 | 59 | 10-12 | 61 | 30 |
| | 11-12 | 1 | .5 | 10-14 | 0 | 0 |
| | 9-10 | 0 | 0 | other | 23 | 11 |
| | 9-14 | 0 | 0 | | | |

| 2. Control of school | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Public | 196 | 95 |
| Non-Public | 11 | 5 |

| 3. Type of community served: | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Urban | 46 | 24 |
| Suburban | 50 | 26 |
| Town | 48 | 25 |
| Rural | 47 | 25 |

| 4. School enrollment: | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Under 400 | 27 | 15 |
| 400-1000 | 65 | 37 |
| 1000-2000 | 60 | 34 |
| over 2000 | 24 | 14 |

| 5. Engage in collective bargaining: | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 155 | 75 |
| No | 22 | 25 |

| 6. Number of years engaged in collective bargaining: | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| 0-3 | 33 | 25 |
| 4-6 | 34 | 25 |
| over 6 | 64 | 50 |

| 7. National affiliation of local bargaining unit: | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| NEA | 124 | 84 |
| AFT | 13 | 9 |
| other | 10 | 7 |

| 8. Principal participation in collective bargaining: | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 91 | 46 |
| No | 107 | 54 |

| 9. Role of principal if participation in collective bargaining: | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Active | 35 | 40 |
| Passive (observer) | 32 | 36 |
| Other | 21 | 24 |

TABLE 2

PART I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION — SURVEY GROUP: SUPERINTENDENTS

1. District grade level organization:

| | n | % | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| K-12 | 145 | 94 | 7-12 | 1 | .6 |
| K-6 | 1 | .6 | 9-14 | 0 | 0 |
| K-14 | 2 | 1.3 | 7-14 | 0 | 0 |
| 9-12 | 1 | .6 | other | 4 | 2.5 |

2. Control of district:

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Public | 156 | 99 |
| Non-public | 1 | 1 |

3. Type of community served:

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Urban | 17 | 13 |
| Suburban | 32 | 24 |
| Town | 40 | 30 |
| Rural | 45 | 34 |

4. District enrollment:

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Under 400 | 3 | 2 |
| 400-5000 | 114 | 75 |
| 5000-15000 | 26 | 17 |
| over 15000 | 10 | 6 |

5. Engage in collective bargaining

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 119 | 76 |
| No | 37 | 24 |

6. Number of years engaged in collective bargaining:

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| 0-3 | 18 | 16 |
| 4-6 | 27 | 24 |
| over 6 | 66 | 60 |

7. National affiliation of local bargaining unit:

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| NEA | 94 | 89 |
| AFT | 9 | 8 |
| other | 3 | 3 |

8. Principal participation in collective bargaining:

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 63 | 46 |
| No | 73 | 54 |

9. Role of principal if participation in collective bargaining:

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| Active | 26 | 42 |
| Passive (observer) | 17 | 27 |
| Other | 19 | 31 |

TABLE 3

PART I - BACKGROUND INFORMATION SURVEY GROUP: COMMUNITY & JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Type of area or community served: | | |
| Urban | 28 | 23 |
| Suburban | 33 | 27 |
| Town | 16 | 13 |
| Rural | 45 | 37 |
| 2. Student enrollment | n | % |
| Under 500 | 10 | 6 |
| 500-1000 | 29 | 17 |
| 1000-3000 | 55 | 32 |
| 3000-5000 | 20 | 12 |
| over 5000 | 59 | 34 |
| 3. Engage in collective bargaining: | n | % |
| Yes | 72 | 41 |
| No | 102 | 59 |
| 4. Number of years engaged in collective bargaining: | n | % |
| 0-3 | 18 | 26 |
| 4-6 | 19 | 28 |
| over 6 | 31 | 46 |
| 5. National affiliation of local bargaining unit: | n | % |
| NEA | 38 | 52 |
| AFT | 20 | 27 |
| AAUP | 1 | 1 |
| other | 14 | 19 |
| 6. Administrator or Board Member involvement in collective bargaining: | n | % |
| Yes | 65 | 48 |
| No | 70 | 52 |
| 7. Role of administrator(s) or Board Member(s) in collective bargaining: | n | % |
| Active | 43 | 77 |
| Passive | 3 | 3 |
| other | 10 | 18 |
| 8. Control of college | n | % |
| State | 42 | 24 |
| Local | 118 | 67 |
| Non-Public | 15 | 9 |

TABLE 4

PART II -- GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

| | Agree Strongly | Agree | Agree Mildly | Disagree Mildly | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Collective bargaining with teachers is becoming more prevelant in schools and community colleges. | | | | | | |
| Principals | 60 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Superintendents | 77 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Community College Presidents | 49 | 43 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. National professional education associations and organizations are aware of the implications of collective bargaining on the administration of schools/colleges. | | | | | | |
| Principals | 23 | 55 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| Superintendents | 31 | 46 | 15 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| Community College Presidents | 12 | 42 | 21 | 11 | 13 | 1 |
| 3. National professional education associations are doing a good job of keeping their members abreast of collective bargaining issues. | | | | | | |
| Principals | 8 | 50 | 29 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| Superintendents | 12 | 47 | 26 | 5 | 8 | 2 |
| Community College Presidents | 3 | 24 | 41 | 14 | 16 | 2 |
| 4. The school/college administrator is increasingly defenseless before the power of teachers and teacher organizations. | | | | | | |
| Principals | 19 | 36 | 23 | 10 | 11 | 1 |
| Superintendents | 17 | 32 | 21 | 12 | 16 | 3 |
| Community College Presidents | 9 | 23 | 27 | 14 | 21 | 6 |
| 5. The superintendent/principal should be <u>actively</u> involved in the teacher negotiations process. | | | | | | |
| Principals | 18 | 35 | 17 | 6 | 16 | 8 |
| Superintendents | 20 | 32 | 8 | 5 | 22 | 12 |

TABLE 4 (cont.)

| PART II -- GENERAL IMPRESSIONS | ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP (percentages) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Agree Strongly | Agree | Agree Mildly | Disagree Mildly | Disagree | Disagree Strongly |
| 6. Collective bargaining has forced administrators to share administrative decision-making with teachers. | | | | | | |
| Principals | 10 | 45 | 30 | 6 | 8 | 0 |
| Superintendents | 17 | 46 | 25 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| Community College Presidents | 8 | 34 | 28 | 10 | 16 | 4 |
| 7. Collective bargaining has resulted in broader responsibilities given to superintendents/principals/community college presidents. | | | | | | |
| Principals | 9 | 30 | 22 | 14 | 22 | 4 |
| Superintendents | 16 | 37 | 12 | 12 | 18 | 5 |
| Community College Presidents | 6 | 25 | 15 | 16 | 31 | 8 |

TABLE 5

PART III -- INSTITUTIONAL RATINGS

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

| | Rating | | | | Effects of Staff Negotiations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Outstanding | Good | Fair | Poor | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 1. Instructional program | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 21 | 58 | 17 | 3 | 19 | 57 | 24 |
| Superintendents | 17 | 68 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 63 | 29 |
| Community College Presidents | 41 | 53 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 47 | 44 |
| 2. Extra-curricular programs | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 15 | 56 | 21 | 8 | 12 | 48 | 40 |
| Superintendents | 18 | 63 | 17 | 3 | 12 | 63 | 25 |
| Community College Presidents | 8 | 50 | 33 | 9 | 0 | 57 | 43 |
| 3. Community support of education | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 15 | 41 | 30 | 14 | 1 | 41 | 58 |
| Superintendents | 15 | 51 | 24 | 10 | 3 | 32 | 65 |
| Community College Presidents | 34 | 43 | 17 | 6 | 4 | 54 | 42 |
| 4. Staff morale | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 12 | 59 | 21 | 9 | 23 | 28 | 49 |
| Superintendents | 8 | 65 | 26 | 1 | 14 | 24 | 62 |
| Community College Presidents | 16 | 65 | 18 | 2 | 24 | 21 | 55 |
| 5. Inservice programs | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 3 | 29 | 49 | 19 | 21 | 59 | 20 |
| Superintendents | 4 | 41 | 51 | 4 | 21 | 51 | 28 |
| Community College Presidents | 3 | 30 | 51 | 17 | 10 | 44 | 47 |
| 6. Student academic achievement | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 8 | 62 | 26 | 4 | 3 | 79 | 18 |
| Superintendents | 7 | 70 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 87 | 12 |
| Community College Presidents | 14 | 75 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 83 | 15 |
| 7. Student morale | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 7 | 68 | 22 | 4 | 3 | 78 | 20 |
| Superintendents | 6 | 75 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 82 | 18 |
| Community College Presidents | 19 | 70 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 81 | 19 |
| 8. Intra-staff communications | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 3 | 56 | 35 | 6 | 22 | 47 | 31 |
| Superintendents | 5 | 60 | 32 | 3 | 24 | 31 | 44 |
| Community College Presidents | 5 | 56 | 35 | 5 | 22 | 31 | 47 |
| 9. Public relations | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 5 | 46 | 37 | 13 | 5 | 43 | 53 |
| Superintendents | 6 | 60 | 25 | 9 | 2 | 35 | 63 |
| Community College Presidents | 23 | 52 | 19 | 5 | 4 | 50 | 46 |

TABLE 5 (cont.)

PART III -- INSTITUTIONAL RATINGS

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

| | Rating | | | | Effects of Staff Negotiations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Outstanding | Good | Fair | Poor | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 10. Professional staff salaries | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 14 | 56 | 27 | 3 | 85 | 13 | 2 |
| Superintendents | 11 | 67 | 21 | 2 | 81 | 14 | 5 |
| Community College Presidents | 27 | 48 | 21 | 4 | 71 | 26 | 3 |
| 11. Fringe benefits for professional staff | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 16 | 52 | 28 | 4 | 84 | 15 | 1 |
| Superintendents | 14 | 57 | 21 | 8 | 80 | 16 | 3 |
| Community College Presidents | 36 | 51 | 12 | 1 | 74 | 24 | 3 |
| 12. Physical facilities | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 17 | 40 | 32 | 11 | 8 | 81 | 11 |
| Superintendents | 18 | 49 | 24 | 8 | 2 | 82 | 17 |
| Community College Presidents | 34 | 44 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 92 | 6 |
| 13. Fiscal condition | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 7 | 40 | 37 | 17 | 3 | 43 | 55 |
| Superintendents | 10 | 47 | 30 | 13 | 2 | 37 | 62 |
| Community College Presidents | 14 | 52 | 25 | 9 | 1 | 42 | 57 |

TABLE 6

PART IV - ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS — ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP (percentages)

| | Importance Rating | | | | | Effects of Staff Negotiations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Important | Relatively Important | Neutral | Relatively Unimportant | Unimportant | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 1. General decision making | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 64 | 31 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 56 |
| Superintendents | 86 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 29 | 62 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 80 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 23 | 53 |
| 2. Building management | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 53 | 41 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 49 | 45 |
| Superintendents | 50 | 38 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 48 | 48 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 23 | 62 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 86 | 11 |
| 3. Business management | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 28 | 54 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 71 | 26 |
| Superintendents | 70 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 57 | 36 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 61 | 36 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 58 | 31 |
| 4. Establishment of educational goals and priorities | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 68 | 27 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 47 | 30 |
| Superintendents | 67 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 56 | 35 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 82 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 37 | 48 |
| 5. Budgeting | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 37 | 43 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 52 | 38 |
| Superintendents | 82 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 39 | 54 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 86 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 38 | 52 |
| 6. Personnel selection, assignment retention & promotion | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 74 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 37 | 54 |
| Superintendents | 70 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 40 | 50 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 69 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 35 | 52 |
| 7. Staff evaluation | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 65 | 30 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 26 | 36 | 38 |
| Superintendents | 56 | 38 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 37 | 29 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 49 | 40 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 61 |
| 8. Curriculum planning | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 63 | 32 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 64 | 18 |
| Superintendents | 45 | 46 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 62 | 27 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 47 | 43 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 51 | 41 |

TABLE 6 (cont.)

PART IV - ADMINISTRATIVE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS — ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP (percentages)

| | Importance Rating | | | | | Effects of Staff Negotiations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Important | Relatively Important | Neutral | Relatively Unimportant | Unimportant | Strengthened | No Effect | Weakened |
| 9. Stimulating innovation & change | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 31 | 55 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 63 | 29 |
| Superintendents | 33 | 55 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 40 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 45 | 48 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 30 | 64 |
| 10. Supervision of instruction | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 58 | 34 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 53 | 36 |
| Superintendents | 45 | 42 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 48 | 36 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 34 | 44 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 28 | 56 |
| 11. Coordinating school activities | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 33 | 54 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 77 | 20 |
| Superintendents | 21 | 55 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 82 | 16 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 18 | 55 | 21 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 69 | 28 |
| 12. Policy development and implementation | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 40 | 51 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 39 | 43 |
| Superintendents | 59 | 33 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 41 | 44 |
| Comm. College Presidents | 74 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 38 | 41 |
| 13. Student Discipline | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 60 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 60 | 33 |
| Superintendents | 35 | 44 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 73 | 20 |

TABLE 7

PART V -- PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN EDUCATION

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

| | Severity or Magnitude | | | | | Future Projection | | | | | Negotiations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Critical Problem or Issue | Important Problem or Issue | Occasional Problem or Issue | Minor Problem or Issue | Not a Present Problem or Issue | Become Much More Critical | Become Slightly More Critical | No Change | Become Slightly Less Critical | Become Much Less Critical | Positive Effect | No Effect | Detrimental Effect |
| 1. School/community relations | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 27 | 47 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 49 | 33 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 27 | 66 |
| Superintendents | 30 | 42 | 17 | 5 | 6 | 52 | 30 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 21 | 73 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 17 | 42 | 22 | 7 | 12 | 32 | 36 | 29 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 35 | 61 |
| 2. Excessive paperwork | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 23 | 35 | 32 | 9 | 1 | 39 | 39 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 52 | 43 |
| Superintendents | 22 | 41 | 30 | 7 | 1 | 37 | 44 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 49 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 16 | 48 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 37 | 42 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 57 |
| 3. Problems of teacher personnel | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 20 | 41 | 29 | 6 | 4 | 40 | 39 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 19 | 73 |
| Superintendents | 21 | 42 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 43 | 40 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 17 | 72 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 15 | 40 | 33 | 6 | 6 | 28 | 37 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 26 | 63 |
| 4. Developing & enforcing policies & regulations | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 23 | 45 | 22 | 5 | 5 | 39 | 39 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 29 | 62 |
| Superintendents | 26 | 37 | 25 | 9 | 3 | 36 | 37 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 28 | 55 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 13 | 41 | 34 | 7 | 5 | 22 | 34 | 41 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 33 | 50 |
| 5. Desegregation -- integration | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 11 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 45 | 17 | 17 | 54 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 84 | 10 |
| Superintendents | 11 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 55 | 13 | 19 | 53 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 87 | 9 |
| 6. Problems of pupil personnel | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 8 | 33 | 40 | 13 | 6 | 12 | 41 | 42 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 69 | 23 |
| Superintendents | 8 | 29 | 37 | 19 | 8 | 17 | 37 | 44 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 71 | 21 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 3 | 17 | 40 | 21 | 19 | 5 | 24 | 61 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 78 | 17 |
| 7. Student discipline control | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 26 | 32 | 28 | 12 | 3 | 27 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 11 | 51 | 38 |
| Superintendents | 18 | 34 | 30 | 13 | 6 | 28 | 33 | 36 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 61 | 25 |
| 8. Drug and alcohol abuse | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 19 | 39 | 25 | 12 | 4 | 18 | 44 | 28 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 87 | 9 |
| Superintendents | 14 | 35 | 38 | 11 | 3 | 24 | 35 | 38 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 83 | 8 |

TABLE 7 (cont.)

PART V -- PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN EDUCATION

ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP
(percentages)

| | Severity or Magnitude | | | | | Future Projection | | | | | Negotiations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Critical Problem or Issue | Important Problem or Issue | Occasional Problem or Issue | Minor Problem or Issue | Not a Present Problem or Issue | Become Much More Critical | Become Slightly More Critical | No Change | Become Slightly Less Critical | Become Much Less Critical | Positive Effect | No Effect | Detrimental Effect |
| 9. Teacher militancy | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 16 | 29 | 25 | 18 | 12 | 32 | 39 | 24 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 77 |
| Superintendents | 26 | 32 | 26 | 13 | 3 | 45 | 41 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 82 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 12 | 27 | 32 | 17 | 14 | 28 | 44 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 69 |
| 10. Accountability demands | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 22 | 43 | 20 | 12 | 3 | 31 | 47 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 23 | 35 | 42 |
| Superintendents | 20 | 38 | 27 | 12 | 3 | 35 | 43 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 38 | 49 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 25 | 45 | 17 | 6 | 7 | 41 | 43 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 28 | 50 |
| 11. Job security | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 16 | 32 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 23 | 41 | 33 | 2 | 1 | 33 | 31 | 35 |
| Superintendents | 22 | 23 | 30 | 17 | 8 | 33 | 39 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 18 | 59 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 11 | 36 | 24 | 18 | 12 | 23 | 34 | 38 | 3 | 3 | 36 | 22 | 42 |
| 12. Declining enrollments | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 20 | 31 | 20 | 12 | 17 | 35 | 34 | 26 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 60 | 31 |
| Superintendents | 22 | 28 | 21 | 16 | 13 | 28 | 31 | 31 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 57 | 36 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 14 | 22 | 17 | 15 | 32 | 29 | 32 | 31 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 57 | 39 |
| 13. Loss of local control | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 23 | 30 | 23 | 11 | 12 | 35 | 33 | 30 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 52 | 41 |
| Superintendents | 36 | 39 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 55 | 30 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 25 | 69 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 29 | 43 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 50 | 31 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 35 | 52 |
| 14. Implementing affirmative action | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 8 | 28 | 34 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 36 | 46 | 3 | 2 | 15 | 60 | 25 |
| Superintendents | 9 | 24 | 38 | 17 | 13 | 16 | 39 | 41 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 64 | 25 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 11 | 42 | 30 | 11 | 6 | 24 | 39 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 14 | 39 | 47 |

TABLE 7 (cont.)

PART V -- PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN EDUCATION — ITEM ANALYSES BY SURVEY GROUP (percentages)

| | Severity or Magnitude | | | | | Future Projection | | | | | Negotiations | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Critical Problem or Issue | Important Problem or Issue | Occasional Problem or Issue | Minor Problem or Issue | Not a Present Problem or Issue | Become Much More Critical | Become Slightly More Critical | No Change | Become Slightly Less Critical | Become Much Less Critical | Positive Effect | No Effect | Detrimental Effect |
| 15. Student attendance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 32 | 34 | 22 | 9 | 3 | 34 | 31 | 29 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 80 | 12 |
| Superintendents | 10 | 24 | 35 | 23 | 8 | 15 | 24 | 57 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 91 | 6 |
| 16. Problems related to controlling board | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 10 | 18 | 39 | 39 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 36 | 52 |
| Superintendents | 15 | 27 | 29 | 16 | 13 | 22 | 32 | 40 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 33 | 59 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 9 | 28 | 33 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 34 | 43 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 36 | 53 |
| 17. Increasing educational costs | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 50 | 40 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 63 | 28 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 18 | 69 |
| Superintendents | 64 | 32 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 70 | 23 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 84 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 52 | 35 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 64 | 25 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 83 |
| 18. Decreasing revenues | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 42 | 37 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 54 | 33 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 34 | 58 |
| Superintendents | 55 | 26 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 57 | 24 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 65 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 40 | 37 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 55 | 31 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 65 |
| 19. Working conditions for professionals staff | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Principals | 12 | 26 | 30 | 21 | 11 | 14 | 34 | 43 | 6 | 3 | 50 | 30 | 20 |
| Superintendents | 7 | 23 | 43 | 19 | 8 | 14 | 40 | 42 | 4 | 1 | 33 | 29 | 39 |
| Comm. College Pres. | 4 | 32 | 35 | 18 | 11 | 14 | 31 | 49 | 5 | 2 | 40 | 25 | 35 |

TABLE 8

POSTN BY VAR020

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR020 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | | 23<br>16.8<br>17.7<br>4.7 | 93<br>67.9<br>31.8<br>18.9 | 14<br>10.2<br>26.4<br>2.8 | 7<br>5.1<br>38.9<br>1.4 | 137<br>27.8 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | | 43<br>21.4<br>33.1<br>8.7 | 117<br>58.2<br>40.1<br>23.7 | 35<br>17.4<br>66.0<br>7.1 | 6<br>3.0<br>33.3<br>1.2 | 201<br>40.8 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | | 64<br>41.3<br>49.2<br>13.0 | 82<br>52.9<br>28.1<br>16.6 | 4<br>2.6<br>7.5<br>0.8 | 5<br>3.2<br>27.8<br>1.0 | 155<br>31.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 130<br>26.4 | 292<br>59.2 | 53<br>10.8 | 18<br>3.7 | 493<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 41.63602 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 9

POSTN BY VAR024

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR024 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | | 40<br>14.5<br>19.6<br>4.0 | 71<br>51.4<br>32.3<br>14.4 | 33<br>23.9<br>27.5<br>6.7 | 14<br>10.1<br>26.9<br>2.8 | 138<br>27.9 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | | 30<br>14.9<br>29.4<br>6.1 | 82<br>40.8<br>37.3<br>16.6 | 60<br>29.9<br>50.0<br>12.1 | 29<br>14.4<br>55.8<br>5.9 | 201<br>40.7 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | | 52<br>33.5<br>51.0<br>10.5 | 67<br>43.2<br>30.5<br>13.6 | 27<br>17.4<br>22.5<br>5.5 | 9<br>5.8<br>17.3<br>1.8 | 155<br>31.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 102<br>20.6 | 220<br>44.5 | 120<br>24.3 | 52<br>10.5 | 494<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 32.16994 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 45

TABLE 10

POSTN BY VAR026

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR026 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | | 11<br>8.0<br>18.6<br>2.2 | 89<br>64.5<br>29.1<br>17.8 | 37<br>26.8<br>34.6<br>7.5 | 1<br>0.7<br>4.8<br>0.2 | 138<br>28.0 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | | 24<br>12.0<br>40.7<br>4.9 | 117<br>58.5<br>38.2<br>23.7 | 42<br>21.0<br>39.3<br>8.5 | 17<br>8.5<br>81.0<br>3.4 | 200<br>40.6 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | | 24<br>15.5<br>40.7<br>4.9 | 100<br>64.5<br>32.7<br>20.3 | 28<br>18.1<br>26.2<br>5.7 | 3<br>1.9<br>14.3<br>0.6 | 155<br>31.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 59<br>12.0 | 306<br>62.1 | 107<br>21.7 | 21<br>4.3 | 493<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 21.24365 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0017

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 11

POSTN BY VAR030

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR030 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | | 9<br>6.7<br>19.6<br>1.8 | 94<br>69.6<br>28.1<br>18.8 | 27<br>20.0<br>28.7<br>5.5 | 5<br>3.7<br>31.3<br>1.0 | 135<br>27.6 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | | 16<br>8.0<br>34.8<br>3.3 | 124<br>62.0<br>37.1<br>25.3 | 52<br>26.0<br>55.3<br>10.6 | 8<br>4.0<br>50.0<br>1.6 | 200<br>40.8 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | | 21<br>13.5<br>45.7<br>4.3 | 116<br>74.8<br>34.7<br>23.7 | 15<br>9.7<br>16.0<br>3.1 | 3<br>1.9<br>18.8<br>0.6 | 155<br>31.6 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 46<br>9.4 | 334<br>68.2 | 94<br>19.2 | 16<br>3.3 | 490<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 19.94563 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0028

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 49

TABLE 12

POSTN BY VAR032

| POSTN | VAR032 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 8<br>6.0<br>15.7<br>1.6 | 100<br>74.8<br>29.2<br>20.5 | 21<br>15.7<br>26.6<br>4.3 | 5<br>3.7<br>35.7<br>1.0 | 134<br>27.5 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 14<br>7.1<br>27.5<br>2.9 | 134<br>67.7<br>39.1<br>27.5 | 43<br>21.7<br>54.4<br>8.8 | 7<br>3.5<br>50.0<br>1.4 | 198<br>40.7 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 29<br>18.7<br>56.9<br>6.0 | 109<br>70.3<br>31.8<br>22.4 | 15<br>9.7<br>19.0<br>3.1 | 2<br>1.3<br>14.3<br>0.4 | 155<br>31.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 51<br>10.5 | 343<br>70.4 | 79<br>16.2 | 14<br>2.9 | 487<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 25.17241 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0003

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 52

TABLE 13

POSTN BY VAR036

| POSTN | VAR036 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 8<br>5.8<br>14.3<br>1.6 | 83<br>60.1<br>32.8<br>16.8 | 34<br>24.6<br>24.6<br>6.9 | 13<br>9.4<br>28.3<br>2.6 | 138<br>28.0 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 10<br>5.0<br>18.5<br>2.0 | 91<br>45.5<br>35.7<br>18.5 | 74<br>37.0<br>53.6<br>15.0 | 25<br>12.5<br>54.3<br>5.1 | 200<br>40.6 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 36<br>23.2<br>66.7<br>7.3 | 81<br>52.3<br>31.8<br>16.4 | 30<br>19.4<br>21.7<br>6.1 | 8<br>5.2<br>17.4<br>1.6 | 155<br>31.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 54<br>11.0 | 255<br>51.7 | 138<br>28.0 | 46<br>9.3 | 493<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 50.05792 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 14

POSTN BY VAR040

| POSTN | VAR040 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 19<br>14.0<br>17.8<br>3.9 | 74<br>57.4<br>29.8<br>15.8 | 28<br>20.6<br>26.9<br>5.7 | 11<br>8.1<br>52.4<br>2.2 | 136<br>27.6 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 33<br>16.3<br>30.8<br>6.7 | 105<br>52.0<br>40.1<br>21.3 | 57<br>28.2<br>54.8<br>11.6 | 7<br>3.5<br>35.0<br>1.4 | 202<br>41.0 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 55<br>35.5<br>51.4<br>11.2 | 79<br>51.0<br>30.2<br>16.0 | 19<br>12.3<br>18.3<br>3.9 | 2<br>1.3<br>10.0<br>0.4 | 155<br>31.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 107<br>21.7 | 262<br>53.1 | 104<br>21.1 | 20<br>4.1 | 493<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 39.79185 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 15

POSTN BY VAR042

| POSTN | VAR042 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 25<br>18.4<br>22.5<br>5.1 | 67<br>49.3<br>31.3<br>13.7 | 33<br>24.3<br>26.6<br>6.7 | 11<br>8.1<br>26.8<br>2.2 | 136<br>27.8 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 34<br>17.1<br>30.6<br>7.0 | 80<br>40.2<br>37.4<br>16.4 | 64<br>32.2<br>52.0<br>13.1 | 21<br>10.6<br>51.2<br>4.3 | 199<br>40.7 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 52<br>33.8<br>46.8<br>10.6 | 67<br>43.5<br>31.3<br>13.7 | 26<br>16.9<br>21.1<br>5.3 | 9<br>5.8<br>22.0<br>1.8 | 154<br>31.5 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 111<br>22.7 | 214<br>43.8 | 123<br>25.2 | 41<br>8.4 | 489<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 24.13907 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 50

TABLE 16

POSTN BY VAR044

| POSTN | VAR044 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 13 | 54 | 40 | 18 | 135 |
| | 9.6 | 40.0 | 29.6 | 13.3 | 27.6 |
| | 26.5 | 25.7 | 26.3 | 27.7 | |
| | 2.7 | 11.1 | 8.2 | 3.7 | |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 14 | 79 | 74 | 33 | 200 |
| | 7.0 | 39.5 | 37.0 | 16.5 | 40.9 |
| | 28.6 | 38.4 | 48.7 | 50.8 | |
| | 2.9 | 16.2 | 15.1 | 6.7 | |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 22 | 80 | 38 | 14 | 154 |
| | 14.3 | 51.9 | 24.7 | 9.1 | 31.5 |
| | 44.9 | 38.4 | 25.0 | 21.5 | |
| | 4.5 | 16.4 | 7.8 | 2.9 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 49 | 213 | 152 | 65 | 489 |
| | 10.0 | 43.6 | 31.1 | 13.3 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 15.69876 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0155

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 50

TABLE 17

POSTN BY VAR022

| POSTN | VAR022 OUTSTANDING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 24 | 86 | 23 | 4 | 137 |
| | 17.5 | 62.8 | 16.8 | 2.9 | 27.8 |
| | 35.3 | 31.3 | 19.8 | 11.8 | |
| | 4.9 | 17.4 | 4.7 | 0.8 | |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 31 | 112 | 42 | 16 | 201 |
| | 15.4 | 55.7 | 20.9 | 8.0 | 40.8 |
| | 45.6 | 40.7 | 36.2 | 47.1 | |
| | 6.3 | 22.7 | 8.5 | 3.2 | |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 13 | 77 | 51 | 14 | 155 |
| | 8.4 | 49.7 | 32.9 | 9.0 | 31.4 |
| | 19.1 | 28.0 | 44.0 | 41.2 | |
| | 2.6 | 15.6 | 10.3 | 2.8 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 68 | 275 | 116 | 34 | 493 |
| | 13.8 | 55.8 | 23.5 | 6.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 20.80917 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0020

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 46

TABLE 18

POSTN BY VAR021

| POSTN | VAR021 STRENGTHENED 1. | NO EFFECTIVE 2. | WEAKENED 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 10 | 72 | 33 | 115 |
| | 8.7 | 62.6 | 28.7 | 34.3 |
| | 22.2 | 37.9 | 33.0 | |
| | 3.0 | 21.5 | 9.9 | |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 28 | 85 | 36 | 149 |
| | 18.8 | 57.0 | 24.2 | 44.5 |
| | 62.2 | 44.7 | 36.0 | |
| | 8.4 | 25.4 | 10.7 | |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 7 | 33 | 31 | 71 |
| | 9.9 | 46.5 | 43.7 | 21.2 |
| | 15.6 | 17.4 | 31.0 | |
| | 2.1 | 9.9 | 9.3 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 45 | 190 | 100 | 335 |
| | 13.4 | 56.7 | 29.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 14.00504 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0073

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 204

TABLE 19

POSTN BY VAR029

| POSTN | VAR029 STRENGTHENED 1. | NO EFFECTIVE 2. | WEAKENED 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 24 | 59 | 32 | 115 |
| | 20.9 | 51.3 | 27.8 | 34.1 |
| | 36.1 | 33.0 | 33.7 | |
| | 7.1 | 17.5 | 9.5 | |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 32 | 89 | 30 | 151 |
| | 21.2 | 59.9 | 19.9 | 44.8 |
| | 50.8 | 49.7 | 31.6 | |
| | 9.5 | 26.4 | 8.9 | |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 7 | 31 | 33 | 71 |
| | 9.9 | 43.7 | 46.5 | 21.1 |
| | 11.1 | 17.3 | 34.7 | |
| | 2.1 | 9.2 | 9.8 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 63 | 179 | 95 | 337 |
| | 18.7 | 53.1 | 28.2 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 18.12975 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0012

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 202

TABLE 20

POSTN BY VAR039

| POSTN | VAR039 1. STRENGTHENED | 2. NO EFFEC T | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 91<br>80.5<br>33.7<br>27.2 | 16<br>14.2<br>29.6<br>4.8 | 6<br>5.3<br>54.5<br>1.8 | 113<br>33.7 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 145<br>96.3<br>47.4<br>36.2 | 19<br>12.7<br>35.2<br>5.7 | 3<br>2.0<br>27.3<br>0.9 | 150<br>44.8 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 51<br>70.8<br>18.9<br>15.2 | 19<br>26.4<br>35.2<br>5.7 | 2<br>2.8<br>18.2<br>0.6 | 72<br>21.5 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 270<br>80.6 | 54<br>16.1 | 11<br>3.3 | 335<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.58002 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0481

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 204

TABLE 21

POSTN BY VAR023

| POSTN | VAR023 1. STRENGTHENED | 2. NO EFFEC T | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 14<br>12.2<br>43.8<br>4.1 | 72<br>62.6<br>38.7<br>21.3 | 29<br>25.2<br>24.2<br>8.6 | 115<br>34.0 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 18<br>11.9<br>56.3<br>5.3 | 73<br>48.3<br>39.2<br>21.6 | 60<br>39.7<br>50.0<br>17.8 | 151<br>44.7 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 41<br>56.9<br>22.0<br>12.1 | 31<br>43.1<br>25.8<br>9.2 | 72<br>21.3 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 32<br>9.5 | 186<br>55.0 | 120<br>35.5 | 338<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.48622 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0024

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 201

TABLE 22

POSTN BY VAR025

| POSTN | VAR025 1. STRENGTHENED | 2. NO EFFEC T | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 3<br>2.6<br>37.5<br>0.9 | 37<br>32.2<br>27.0<br>11.0 | 75<br>65.2<br>39.1<br>22.3 | 115<br>34.1 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 2<br>1.3<br>25.0<br>0.6 | 62<br>41.1<br>45.3<br>18.4 | 87<br>57.6<br>45.3<br>25.8 | 151<br>44.8 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 3<br>4.2<br>37.5<br>0.9 | 38<br>53.5<br>27.7<br>11.3 | 30<br>42.3<br>15.6<br>8.9 | 71<br>21.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 8<br>2.4 | 137<br>40.7 | 192<br>57.0 | 337<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.76732 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0293

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 202

TABLE 23

POSTN BY VAR035

| POSTN | VAR035 1. STRENGTHENED | 2. NO EFFEC T | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 28<br>24.3<br>36.4<br>8.3 | 36<br>31.3<br>27.9<br>10.7 | 51<br>44.3<br>38.6<br>15.1 | 115<br>34.0 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 33<br>21.9<br>42.9<br>9.8 | 71<br>47.0<br>55.0<br>21.1 | 47<br>31.1<br>35.6<br>13.9 | 151<br>44.7 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 16<br>22.2<br>20.8<br>4.7 | 22<br>30.6<br>17.1<br>6.5 | 34<br>47.2<br>25.8<br>10.1 | 72<br>21.3 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 77<br>22.8 | 129<br>38.2 | 132<br>39.1 | 338<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.28916 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0358

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 201

TABLE 24

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR020

| VAR007 | VAR020 1. OUTSTAND ING | 2. GOOD | 3. FAIR | 4. POOR | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. PRIV-UNDER 500 | 6<br>23.1<br>15.4<br>3.5 | 17<br>65.4<br>17.2<br>10.0 | 3<br>11.5<br>11.1<br>1.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 26<br>15.3 |
| 6. PRIV-400-1000 | 7<br>11.3<br>17.9<br>4.1 | 44<br>71.0<br>44.4<br>25.9 | 8<br>12.9<br>29.6<br>4.7 | 3<br>4.8<br>60.0<br>1.8 | 62<br>36.5 |
| 7. PRIV-1000-2000 | 16<br>27.6<br>41.0<br>9.4 | 31<br>53.4<br>31.3<br>18.2 | 10<br>17.2<br>37.0<br>5.9 | 1<br>1.7<br>20.0<br>0.6 | 58<br>34.1 |
| 8. PRIV-OVER2000 | 10<br>41.7<br>25.6<br>5.9 | 7<br>29.2<br>7.1<br>4.1 | 6<br>25.0<br>22.2<br>3.5 | 1<br>4.2<br>20.0<br>0.6 | 24<br>14.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 39<br>22.9 | 99<br>58.2 | 27<br>15.9 | 5<br>2.9 | 170<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 17.46460 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0419

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 25

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR038

| VAR007 | VAR038 1. OUTSTAND ING | 2. GOOD | 3. FAIR | 4. POOR | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. PRIV-UNDER 500 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 15<br>57.7<br>16.1<br>8.7 | 11<br>42.3<br>22.0<br>6.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 26<br>15.1 |
| 6. PRIV-400-1000 | 6<br>9.5<br>25.0<br>3.5 | 30<br>47.6<br>32.1<br>17.4 | 23<br>36.5<br>46.0<br>13.4 | 4<br>6.3<br>80.0<br>2.3 | 63<br>36.6 |
| 7. PRIV-1000-2000 | 10<br>16.9<br>41.7<br>5.8 | 39<br>61.0<br>38.7<br>20.9 | 12<br>20.3<br>24.0<br>7.0 | 1<br>1.7<br>20.0<br>0.6 | 59<br>34.3 |
| 8. PRIV-OVER2000 | 8<br>33.3<br>33.3<br>4.7 | 12<br>50.0<br>12.9<br>7.0 | 4<br>16.7<br>8.0<br>2.3 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 24<br>14.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 24<br>14.0 | 93<br>54.1 | 50<br>29.1 | 5<br>2.9 | 172<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 22.40445 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0077

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 26

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR040

| VAR007 | VAR040 1. OUTSTAND ING | 2. GOOD | 3. FAIR | 4. POOR | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. PRIV-UNDER 500 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 15<br>57.7<br>17.9<br>8.8 | 9<br>34.6<br>17.3<br>5.3 | 2<br>7.7<br>28.6<br>1.2 | 26<br>15.2 |
| 6. PRIV-400-1000 | 7<br>11.1<br>25.0<br>4.1 | 27<br>42.9<br>32.1<br>15.8 | 25<br>39.7<br>48.1<br>14.6 | 4<br>6.3<br>57.1<br>2.3 | 63<br>36.8 |
| 7. PRIV-1000-2000 | 14<br>24.1<br>93.3<br>8.2 | 30<br>51.7<br>35.7<br>17.5 | 13<br>22.4<br>25.0<br>7.6 | 1<br>1.7<br>14.3<br>0.6 | 58<br>33.9 |
| 8. PRIV-OVER2000 | 7<br>29.2<br>25.0<br>4.1 | 12<br>50.0<br>14.3<br>7.0 | 5<br>20.8<br>9.6<br>2.9 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 24<br>14.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 28<br>16.4 | 84<br>49.1 | 52<br>30.4 | 7<br>4.1 | 171<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 19.09183 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0241

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 27

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR038

| VAR005 | VAR038 1. OUTSTAND ING | 2. GOOD | 3. FAIR | 4. POOR | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC | 29<br>15.1<br>100.0<br>14.3 | 111<br>57.8<br>97.4<br>54.7 | 49<br>25.5<br>89.1<br>24.1 | 3<br>1.6<br>60.0<br>1.5 | 192<br>94.6 |
| 2. NON-PUBLIC | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 3<br>27.3<br>2.6<br>1.5 | 6<br>54.5<br>10.9<br>3.0 | 2<br>18.2<br>40.0<br>1.0 | 11<br>5.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 29<br>14.3 | 114<br>56.2 | 55<br>27.1 | 5<br>2.5 | 203<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 18.29105 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.004

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 28

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR040

| VAR005 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR040 OUTSTAND 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUBLIC | 1. | 33 / 17.3 / 100.0 / 16.3 | 104 / 54.5 / 99.0 / 51.5 | 50 / 26.2 / 87.7 / 24.8 | 4 / 2.1 / 57.1 / 2.0 | 191 / 94.6 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 2. | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 1 / 9.1 / 1.0 / 0.5 | 7 / 63.6 / 12.3 / 3.5 | 3 / 27.3 / 42.9 / 1.5 | 11 / 5.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 33 / 16.3 | 105 / 52.0 | 57 / 28.2 | 7 / 3.5 | 202 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 30.21703 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 29

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR020

| VAR005 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR020 OUTSTAND 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUBLIC | 1. | 37 / 19.5 / 86.0 / 18.4 | 112 / 59.0 / 95.7 / 55.7 | 35 / 18.4 / 100.0 / 17.4 | 6 / 3.2 / 100.0 / 3.0 | 190 / 94.5 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 2. | 6 / 54.5 / 14.0 / 3.0 | 5 / 45.5 / 4.3 / 2.5 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 11 / 5.5 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 43 / 21.4 | 117 / 58.2 | 35 / 17.4 | 6 / 3.0 | 201 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 8.07741 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0334

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 30

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR034

| VAR005 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR034 OUTSTAND 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUBLIC | 1. | 4 / 2.1 / 66.7 / 2.0 | 108 / 56.8 / 95.6 / 53.7 | 66 / 34.7 / 94.3 / 32.8 | 12 / 6.3 / 100.0 / 6.0 | 190 / 94.5 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 2. | 2 / 18.2 / 33.3 / 1.0 | 5 / 45.5 / 4.4 / 2.5 | 4 / 36.4 / 5.7 / 2.0 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 11 / 5.5 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 6 / 3.0 | 113 / 56.2 | 70 / 34.8 | 12 / 6.0 | 201 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.84534 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0199

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 31

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR019

| VAR001 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR019 OUTSTAND 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STATE | 1. | 7 / 17.9 / 13.5 / 4.5 | 20 / 51.3 / 29.4 / 12.9 | 10 / 25.6 / 37.0 / 6.5 | 2 / 5.1 / 22.2 / 1.3 | 39 / 25.2 |
| LOCAL | 2. | 45 / 43.3 / 86.5 / 29.0 | 42 / 40.4 / 61.7 / 27.1 | 11 / 10.6 / 40.7 / 7.1 | 6 / 5.8 / 66.7 / 3.9 | 104 / 67.1 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 3. | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 6 / 46.2 / 8.8 / 3.9 | 6 / 46.2 / 22.2 / 3.9 | 1 / 7.7 / 11.1 / 0.6 | 13 / 8.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 52 / 33.5 | 68 / 43.9 | 27 / 17.4 | 9 / 5.8 | 155 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 22.39492 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0010

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

TABLE 32

YEARS BY VAR038

| YEARS | VAR038 OUTSTAND | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | |
| 0 - 3 1. | 3<br>9.1<br>4.5<br>2.3 | 20<br>60.6<br>29.9<br>15.3 | 12<br>36.4<br>41.4<br>9.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 33<br>25.2 |
| 4 - 6 2. | 3<br>8.8<br>11.6<br>4.6 | 23<br>67.6<br>29.5<br>17.6 | 7<br>20.6<br>24.1<br>5.3 | 1<br>2.9<br>50.0<br>0.8 | 34<br>26.0 |
| OVER 6 3. | 13<br>20.3<br>59.1<br>10.7 | 35<br>54.7<br>44.9<br>26.7 | 10<br>15.6<br>34.5<br>7.6 | 1<br>1.6<br>50.0<br>0.8 | 64<br>48.9 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 22<br>16.8 | 78<br>59.5 | 29<br>22.1 | 2<br>1.5 | 131<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 19.76936 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0031

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 76

TABLE 33

YEARS BY VAR040

| YEARS | VAR040 OUTSTAND | GOOD | FAIR | POOR | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | |
| 0 - 3 1. | 3<br>9.4<br>11.1<br>2.3 | 16<br>50.0<br>21.3<br>12.3 | 12<br>37.5<br>48.0<br>9.2 | 1<br>3.1<br>33.3<br>0.8 | 32<br>24.6 |
| 4 - 6 2. | 4<br>11.8<br>14.8<br>3.1 | 22<br>64.7<br>29.3<br>16.9 | 7<br>20.6<br>28.0<br>5.4 | 1<br>2.9<br>33.3<br>0.8 | 34<br>26.2 |
| OVER 6 3. | 20<br>31.3<br>74.1<br>15.4 | 37<br>57.8<br>49.3<br>28.5 | 6<br>9.4<br>24.0<br>4.6 | 1<br>1.6<br>33.3<br>0.8 | 64<br>49.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 27<br>20.8 | 75<br>57.7 | 25<br>19.2 | 3<br>2.3 | 130<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.45565 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0115

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 77

TABLE 34

YEARS BY VAR039

| YEARS | VAR039 STRENGTH | NO EFFEC | WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. | |
| 0 - 3 1. | 21<br>67.7<br>14.4<br>16.7 | 8<br>25.8<br>53.3<br>6.3 | 2<br>6.5<br>66.7<br>1.6 | 31<br>24.6 |
| 4 - 6 2. | 25<br>83.3<br>17.1<br>19.8 | 4<br>12.9<br>26.7<br>3.2 | 1<br>3.2<br>33.3<br>0.8 | 31<br>24.6 |
| OVER 6 3. | 51<br>80.3<br>35.0<br>40.5 | 3<br>4.7<br>20.0<br>2.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 64<br>50.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 146<br>115.9 | 15<br>11.9 | 3<br>2.4 | 126<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 13.60122 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0091

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 81

TABLE 35

YEARS BY VAR041

| YEARS | VAR041 STRENGTH | NO EFFEC | WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1. | 2. | 3. | |
| 0 - 3 1. | 20<br>66.7<br>19.0<br>15.9 | 10<br>33.3<br>50.0<br>7.9 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 30<br>23.8 |
| 4 - 6 2. | 26<br>81.3<br>24.8<br>20.6 | 5<br>15.6<br>25.0<br>4.0 | 1<br>3.1<br>100.0<br>0.8 | 32<br>25.4 |
| OVER 6 3. | 59<br>92.2<br>56.2<br>46.8 | 5<br>7.8<br>25.0<br>4.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 64<br>50.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 105<br>83.3 | 20<br>15.9 | 1<br>0.8 | 126<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.93906 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0116

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 81

TABLE 36

YEARS BY VAR027

| YEARS | VAR027 STRENGTH WD EFFEC WEAKENED 1. | 2. | 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 3 1. | 5 / 19.7 / 17.2 / 3.9 | 4 / 13.3 / 11.1 / 3.1 | 21 / 70.0 / 33.9 / 16.5 | 30 / 23.6 |
| 4 - 6 2. | 6 / 18.2 / 20.7 / 4.7 | 9 / 27.3 / 25.0 / 7.1 | 18 / 54.5 / 29.0 / 14.2 | 33 / 26.0 |
| OVER 6 3. | 18 / 28.1 / 62.1 / 14.2 | 23 / 35.9 / 63.9 / 18.1 | 25 / 39.1 / 40.3 / 19.7 | 64 / 50.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 29 / 22.8 | 36 / 28.3 | 62 / 48.8 | 127 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.45086 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0335

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 80

TABLE 37

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR026

| VAR008 | VAR026 OUTSTAND GOOD 1. | 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES 1. | 12 / 7.8 / 50.0 / 5.5 | 87 / 57.2 / 74.4 / 39.5 | 37 / 24.3 / 88.1 / 16.8 | 16 / 10.5 / 94.1 / 7.3 | 152 / 69.1 |
| NO 2. | 12 / 25.0 / 50.0 / 5.5 | 30 / 62.5 / 25.6 / 13.6 | 5 / 10.4 / 11.9 / 2.3 | 1 / 2.1 / 5.9 / .5 | 48 / 21.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 24 / 10.9 | 117 / 53.2 | 42 / 19.1 | 17 / 7.7 | 220 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 15.49544 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0014

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 38

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR044

| VAR008 | VAR044 OUTSTAND GOOD 1. | 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES 1. | 12 / 7.9 / 80.7 / 6.0 | 53 / 34.9 / 67.1 / 26.5 | 27 / 17.8 / 77.1 / 13.5 | 30 / 19.7 / 90.9 / 15.0 | 152 / 76.0 |
| NO 2. | 2 / 4.2 / 19.3 / 1.0 | 26 / 54.2 / 32.9 / 13.0 | 17 / 35.4 / 22.9 / 8.5 | 3 / 6.3 / 9.1 / 1.5 | 48 / 24.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 14 / 7.0 | 79 / 39.5 | 74 / 37.0 | 33 / 16.5 | 200 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 8.22913 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0415

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 39

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR024

| VAR008 | VAR024 OUTSTAND GOOD 1. | 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES 1. | 18 / 11.8 / 60.0 / 9.0 | 59 / 38.8 / 72.0 / 29.4 | 50 / 32.7 / 83.3 / 24.9 | 26 / 17.0 / 89.7 / 12.9 | 153 / 76.1 |
| NO 2. | 12 / 25.0 / 40.0 / 6.0 | 23 / 47.9 / 28.0 / 11.4 | 10 / 20.8 / 16.7 / 5.0 | 3 / 6.3 / 10.3 / 1.5 | 48 / 23.9 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 30 / 14.9 | 82 / 40.8 | 60 / 29.9 | 29 / 14.4 | 201 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.71286 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0212

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 40

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR034

| VAR008 | VAR034 OUTSTANDING | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. YES | 3 / 2.0 / 50.0 / 1.5 | 79 / 51.6 / 69.9 / 39.3 | 60 / 39.2 / 83.3 / 29.9 | 11 / 7.2 / 91.7 / 5.5 | 153 / 76.1 |
| 2. NO | 3 / 6.3 / 50.0 / 1.5 | 34 / 70.8 / 30.1 / 16.9 | 12 / 25.0 / 16.7 / 5.3 | 1 / 2.1 / 8.3 / 0.5 | 48 / 23.9 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 6 / 3.0 | 113 / 56.2 | 72 / 35.8 | 12 / 6.0 | 201 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.78837 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0205

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 41

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR020

| VAR008 | VAR020 OUTSTANDING | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. YES | 24 / 15.7 / 55.8 / 11.9 | 90 / 58.8 / 76.9 / 44.8 | 33 / 21.6 / 94.3 / 16.4 | 6 / 3.9 / 100.0 / 3.0 | 153 / 76.1 |
| 2. NO | 19 / 39.6 / 44.2 / 9.5 | 27 / 56.3 / 23.1 / 13.4 | 2 / 4.2 / 5.7 / 1.0 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 48 / 23.9 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 43 / 21.4 | 117 / 58.2 | 35 / 17.4 | 6 / 3.0 | 201 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 18.03145 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 42

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR022

| VAR008 | VAR022 OUTSTANDING | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. YES | 19 / 12.4 / 61.3 / 9.5 | 82 / 53.6 / 73.9 / 40.8 | 37 / 24.2 / 86.1 / 18.4 | 15 / 9.8 / 93.8 / 7.5 | 153 / 76.1 |
| 2. NO | 12 / 25.0 / 38.7 / 6.0 | 29 / 60.4 / 26.1 / 14.4 | 6 / 12.5 / 13.9 / 3.0 | 1 / 2.1 / 6.3 / 0.5 | 48 / 23.9 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 31 / 15.4 | 111 / 55.2 | 43 / 21.4 | 16 / 8.0 | 201 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.31984 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0160

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 43

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR030

| VAR008 | VAR030 OUTSTANDING | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. YES | 10 / 6.6 / 62.5 / 3.0 | 89 / 58.6 / 71.8 / 44.9 | 45 / 29.6 / 93.8 / 22.5 | 8 / 5.3 / 100.0 / 4.0 | 152 / 76.0 |
| 2. NO | 6 / 12.5 / 37.5 / 3.0 | 35 / 72.9 / 28.2 / 17.5 | 7 / 14.6 / 14.6 / 3.5 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 48 / 24.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 16 / 8.0 | 124 / 62.0 | 52 / 26.0 | 8 / 4.0 | 200 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 8.50515 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0367

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 44

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR032

| VAR008 | VAR032 OUTSTANDING | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. YES | 7 / 4.7 / 53.8 / 3.5 | 99 / 66.0 / 76.7 / 50.0 | 37 / 24.7 / 80.0 / 18.7 | 7 / 4.7 / 100.0 / 3.5 | 150 / 75.8 |
| 2. NO | 7 / 14.6 / 50.0 / 3.5 | 29 / 72.9 / 23.1 / 14.7 | 6 / 12.5 / 13.0 / 3.0 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 48 / 24.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 14 / 7.1 | 128 / 64.7 | 43 / 21.7 | 7 / 3.5 | 198 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.03315 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0183

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 9

TABLE 45

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR038

| VAR008 | VAR038 OUTSTANDING | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. YES | 27 / 17.4 / 93.1 / 13.5 | 93 / 60.0 / 81.6 / 46.8 | 33 / 21.3 / 80.5 / 16.3 | 2 / 1.3 / 40.0 / 1.0 | 155 / 78.4 |
| 2. NO | 2 / 4.3 / 6.9 / 1.0 | 21 / 43.8 / 18.4 / 10.6 | 8 / 16.7 / 19.5 / 4.0 | 3 / 6.3 / 60.0 / 1.5 | 48 / 23.6 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 29 / 14.3 | 114 / 56.2 | 41 / 27.1 | 5 / 2.5 | 203 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 18.03773 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 46

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR040

| VAR008 | | VAR040 OUTSTAND ING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 22 | 91 | 28 | 5 | 154 |
| | | 10.8 | 59.1 | 18.2 | 3.2 | 76.2 |
| | | 97.0 | 83.7 | 77.8 | 41.7 | |
| | | 10.9 | 45.0 | 13.9 | 2.5 | |
| NO | 2. | 1 | 18 | 8 | 7 | 48 |
| | | 2.1 | 37.5 | 16.7 | 14.6 | 23.8 |
| | | 3.0 | 16.3 | 22.2 | 58.3 | |
| | | 0.5 | 8.9 | 3.9 | 3.5 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 33 | 109 | 36 | 12 | 202 |
| | | 16.3 | 54.0 | 17.8 | 5.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 41.57198 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 47

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR038

| VAR008 | | VAR038 OUTSTAND ING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 14 | 84 | 16 | 1 | 115 |
| | | 12.2 | 73.0 | 13.9 | 0.9 | 85.2 |
| | | 93.3 | 92.3 | 59.3 | 50.0 | |
| | | 10.4 | 62.2 | 11.9 | 0.7 | |
| NO | 2. | 1 | 7 | 11 | 1 | 20 |
| | | 5.0 | 35.0 | 55.0 | 5.0 | 14.8 |
| | | 6.7 | 7.7 | 40.7 | 50.0 | |
| | | 0.7 | 5.2 | 8.1 | 0.7 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 15 | 91 | 27 | 2 | 135 |
| | | 11.1 | 67.4 | 20.0 | 1.5 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 20.78954 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 48

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR040

| VAR008 | | VAR040 OUTSTAND ING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 17 | 72 | 20 | 6 | 115 |
| | | 14.8 | 62.6 | 17.4 | 5.2 | 85.2 |
| | | 89.5 | 92.3 | 71.4 | 60.0 | |
| | | 12.6 | 53.3 | 14.8 | 4.4 | |
| NO | 2. | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 20 |
| | | 10.0 | 30.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 14.8 |
| | | 10.5 | 7.7 | 28.6 | 40.0 | |
| | | 1.5 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 3.0 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 19 | 78 | 28 | 10 | 135 |
| | | 14.1 | 57.8 | 20.7 | 7.4 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.66710 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0055

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 49

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR042

| VAR008 | | VAR042 OUTSTAND ING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 19 | 63 | 27 | 7 | 115 |
| | | 16.5 | 54.8 | 23.5 | 6.1 | 85.2 |
| | | 70.4 | 94.0 | 79.4 | 63.6 | |
| | | 14.1 | 46.7 | 20.0 | 5.2 | |
| NO | 2. | 8 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 20 |
| | | 40.0 | 20.0 | 35.0 | 20.0 | 14.8 |
| | | 29.6 | 6.0 | 20.6 | 36.4 | |
| | | 5.9 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 3.0 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 27 | 67 | 34 | 11 | 135 |
| | | 20.0 | 49.6 | 25.2 | 8.1 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 8.55370 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0359

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 50

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAF BY VAR033

| VAR004 | | VAR033 OUTSTAND ING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 27 | 36 | 7 | 0 | 70 |
| | | 38.6 | 51.4 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 45.8 |
| | | 62.8 | 43.9 | 21.9 | 0.0 | |
| | | 17.6 | 23.5 | 4.6 | 0.0 | |
| NO | 2. | 16 | 38 | 25 | 6 | 83 |
| | | 19.3 | 45.8 | 30.1 | 7.2 | 54.2 |
| | | 37.2 | 51.7 | 78.1 | 100.0 | |
| | | 10.5 | 24.8 | 16.3 | 3.9 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 43 | 74 | 32 | 6 | 153 |
| | | 28.8 | 48.4 | 20.9 | 3.9 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 19.33801 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 51

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAF BY VAR037

| VAR004 | | VAR037 OUTSTAND ING 1. | GOOD 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 29 | 31 | 7 | 3 | 69 |
| | | 42.0 | 44.9 | 10.1 | 4.3 | 44.8 |
| | | 55.8 | 46.3 | 20.6 | 27.3 | |
| | | 18.8 | 20.1 | 4.5 | 1.9 | |
| NO | 2. | 23 | 36 | 27 | 8 | 85 |
| | | 27.1 | 42.4 | 31.8 | 9.4 | 55.2 |
| | | 44.2 | 53.7 | 79.4 | 72.7 | |
| | | 14.9 | 23.4 | 17.5 | 5.2 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 52 | 67 | 34 | 11 | 154 |
| | | 33.8 | 43.5 | 22.1 | 7.1 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 7.80358 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0503

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 21

TABLE 52

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF BY VAR019

| VAR004 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR019 1. OUTSTAND GOOD | 2. FAIR | 3. POOR | 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 17<br>24.3<br>50.0<br>11.0 | 38<br>54.3<br>59.4<br>24.5 | 9<br>12.9<br>69.2<br>5.8 | 6<br>8.6<br>66.7<br>3.9 | 70<br>45.2 |
| NO | 2. | 17<br>20.0<br>50.0<br>11.0 | 26<br>30.6<br>40.6<br>16.8 | 4<br>4.7<br>30.8<br>2.6 | 3<br>3.5<br>33.3<br>1.9 | 50<br>54.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 34<br>21.9 | 64<br>41.3 | 13<br>8.4 | 9<br>5.8 | 155<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.01293 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0179

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

TABLE 53

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAF BY VAR027

| VAR004 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR027 1. OUTSTAND GOOD | 2. | FAIR 3. | POOR 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 11<br>15.7<br>37.9<br>7.1 | 48<br>68.6<br>72.7<br>31.0 | 11<br>15.7<br>73.3<br>7.1 | 2<br>2.9<br>100.0<br>1.3 | 70<br>45.2 |
| NO | 2. | 18<br>21.2<br>62.1<br>11.6 | 63<br>74.1<br>57.8<br>40.6 | 4<br>4.7<br>26.7<br>2.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 85<br>54.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 29<br>18.7 | 109<br>70.3 | 15<br>9.7 | 2<br>1.3 | 155<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 8.25319 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0414

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 20

TABLE 54

POSTN BY VAR046

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR046 1. VERY IMP ORTANT | 2. RELATIVE LY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVE LY UNIMP | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUPERINTENDENTS | 1. | 121<br>85.8<br>31.9<br>24.1 | 18<br>12.8<br>16.1<br>3.6 | 2<br>1.3<br>25.0<br>0.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 141<br>28.0 |
| PRINCIPALS | 2. | 129<br>64.2<br>34.0<br>25.6 | 63<br>31.3<br>56.3<br>12.5 | 5<br>2.5<br>62.5<br>1.0 | 4<br>2.0<br>100.0<br>0.8 | 201<br>40.0 |
| J.C.PRESIDENTS | 3. | 129<br>80.1<br>34.0<br>25.6 | 31<br>19.3<br>27.7<br>6.2 | 1<br>0.6<br>12.5<br>0.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 161<br>32.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 379<br>75.3 | 112<br>22.3 | 8<br>1.6 | 4<br>0.8 | 503<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 27.97171 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 86

TABLE 55

POSTN BY VAR050

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR050 1. VERY IMP ORTANT | 2. RELATIVE LY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVE LY UNIMP | 5. UNIMPORT ANT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUPERINTENDENTS | 1. | 100<br>70.4<br>39.4<br>19.9 | 38<br>26.8<br>18.7<br>7.6 | 4<br>2.8<br>11.8<br>0.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 142<br>28.3 |
| PRINCIPALS | 2. | 56<br>28.1<br>22.0<br>11.2 | 107<br>53.8<br>52.7<br>21.3 | 27<br>13.6<br>79.4<br>5.4 | 8<br>4.0<br>80.0<br>1.6 | 1<br>0.5<br>100.0<br>0.2 | 199<br>39.6 |
| J.C.PRESIDENTS | 3. | 98<br>60.9<br>38.6<br>19.5 | 58<br>36.0<br>28.6<br>11.6 | 3<br>1.9<br>8.8<br>0.6 | 2<br>1.2<br>20.0<br>0.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 161<br>32.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 254<br>50.6 | 203<br>40.4 | 34<br>6.8 | 10<br>2.0 | 1<br>0.2 | 502<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 81.80316 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 56

POSTN BY VAR054

| POSTN | VAR054 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP. | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 116<br>81.7<br>35.7<br>23.1 | 20<br>14.1<br>10.6<br>4.0 | 2<br>1.4<br>5.4<br>0.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 142<br>28.3 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 73<br>36.7<br>22.5<br>14.5 | 39<br>43.6<br>20.7<br>17.1 | 33<br>16.6<br>87.2<br>6.6 | 7<br>3.5<br>87.5<br>1.4 | 199<br>39.6 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 129<br>80.1<br>39.8<br>25.7 | 19<br>11.8<br>10.1<br>3.8 | 2<br>1.2<br>5.4<br>0.4 | 1<br>0.6<br>12.5<br>0.2 | 161<br>32.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 323<br>64.3 | 178<br>35.7 | 37<br>7.4 | 8<br>1.6 | 502<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 127.62924 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 57

POSTN BY VAR068

| POSTN | VAR068 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP. | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP. | 5. UNIMPORTANT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 83<br>58.9<br>27.5<br>16.6 | 46<br>32.6<br>24.7<br>9.2 | 9<br>6.4<br>36.0<br>1.8 | 2<br>1.4<br>28.6<br>0.4 | 1<br>0.7<br>12.5<br>0.2 | 141<br>28.2 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 79<br>39.9<br>26.2<br>15.8 | 100<br>50.5<br>53.8<br>20.0 | 15<br>7.6<br>60.0<br>3.0 | 4<br>2.0<br>57.1<br>0.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 198<br>39.6 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 119<br>73.9<br>42.3<br>23.8 | 40<br>24.8<br>21.5<br>8.0 | 1<br>0.6<br>4.0<br>0.2 | 1<br>0.6<br>14.3<br>0.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 161<br>32.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 281<br>56.2 | 186<br>37.2 | 25<br>5.0 | 7<br>1.4 | 1<br>0.2 | 500<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 46.47970 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 39

TABLE 58

POSTN BY VAR058

| POSTN | VAR058 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP. | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP. | 5. UNIMPORTANT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 79<br>56.0<br>27.7<br>15.7 | 53<br>37.6<br>29.9<br>10.6 | 9<br>6.4<br>26.5<br>1.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 141<br>28.1 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 129<br>64.8<br>45.3<br>25.7 | 60<br>30.2<br>33.9<br>12.0 | 8<br>4.0<br>23.5<br>1.6 | 1<br>0.5<br>50.0<br>0.2 | 2<br>1.0<br>100.0<br>0.4 | 200<br>39.8 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 79<br>49.1<br>27.7<br>15.7 | 64<br>39.8<br>36.2<br>12.7 | 17<br>10.6<br>50.0<br>3.4 | 1<br>0.6<br>50.0<br>0.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 161<br>32.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 287<br>57.2 | 177<br>35.3 | 34<br>6.8 | 2<br>0.4 | 2<br>0.4 | 502<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.01122 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0422

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 59

POSTN BY VAR060

| POSTN | VAR060 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP. | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP. | 5. UNIMPORTANT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 64<br>45.4<br>26.2<br>12.8 | 62<br>44.0<br>33.9<br>12.4 | 12<br>8.5<br>36.4<br>2.4 | 3<br>2.1<br>60.0<br>0.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 141<br>28.2 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 124<br>62.6<br>47.9<br>24.8 | 63<br>31.8<br>32.5<br>12.6 | 8<br>4.0<br>24.2<br>1.6 | 2<br>1.0<br>33.3<br>0.4 | 1<br>0.5<br>66.7<br>0.2 | 198<br>39.6 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 70<br>47.2<br>28.8<br>13.2 | 69<br>42.9<br>35.0<br>13.8 | 13<br>8.1<br>39.4<br>2.6 | 1<br>0.6<br>66.7<br>0.2 | 1<br>0.6<br>33.3<br>0.2 | 161<br>32.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 264<br>52.8 | 197<br>39.4 | 33<br>6.6 | 3<br>0.6 | 3<br>0.6 | 500<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 17.68539 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0237

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 39

TABLE 60

POSTN BY VAR064

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR064 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP | 5. UNIMPORTANT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | | 64 | 59 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 141 |
| | | 45.4 | 41.8 | 12.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 28.1 |
| | | 27.1 | 29.6 | 29.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | |
| | | 12.7 | 11.8 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | | 117 | 69 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 200 |
| | | 58.5 | 34.5 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 39.8 |
| | | 49.6 | 34.7 | 17.2 | 16.7 | 100.0 | |
| | | 23.3 | 13.7 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | | 55 | 71 | 31 | 4 | 0 | 161 |
| | | 34.2 | 44.1 | 19.3 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 32.1 |
| | | 23.3 | 35.7 | 53.4 | 66.7 | 0.0 | |
| | | 11.0 | 14.1 | 6.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 236 | 199 | 58 | 6 | 3 | 502 |
| | | 47.0 | 39.6 | 11.6 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 37.24829 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 61

POSTN BY VAR048

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR048 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP | 5. UNIMPORTANT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | | 71 | 54 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 141 |
| | | 50.4 | 38.3 | 9.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 28.1 |
| | | 33.3 | 23.0 | 36.8 | 7.1 | 50.0 | |
| | | 14.1 | 10.8 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | | 105 | 82 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 200 |
| | | 52.5 | 41.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 39.8 |
| | | 49.3 | 34.9 | 21.1 | 28.6 | 50.0 | |
| | | 20.9 | 16.3 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.2 | |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | | 37 | 99 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 161 |
| | | 23.0 | 61.5 | 9.9 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 32.1 |
| | | 17.4 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 64.3 | 0.0 | |
| | | 7.4 | 19.7 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 213 | 235 | 38 | 14 | 2 | 502 |
| | | 42.4 | 46.8 | 7.6 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 46.05051 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 37

TABLE 62

POSTN BY VAR052

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR052 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | | 93 | 38 | 8 | 1 | 140 |
| | | 66.4 | 27.1 | 5.6 | 0.7 | 28.3 |
| | | 26.2 | 32.5 | 50.0 | 16.7 | |
| | | 18.8 | 7.7 | 1.6 | 0.2 | |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | | 128 | 59 | 6 | 4 | 198 |
| | | 64.6 | 29.8 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 39.5 |
| | | 37.3 | 49.3 | 37.5 | 66.7 | |
| | | 26.9 | 12.6 | 1.2 | 0.8 | |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | | 132 | 26 | 2 | 1 | 161 |
| | | 82.0 | 16.1 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 32.1 |
| | | 36.9 | 22.2 | 12.5 | 16.7 | |
| | | 26.3 | 5.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 342 | 117 | 16 | 6 | 501 |
| | | 72.3 | 23.4 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 14.63089 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0215

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 38

TABLE 63

POSTN BY VAR062

| POSTN | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR062 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP | 5. UNIMPORTANT | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | | 47 | 78 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 141 |
| | | 33.3 | 55.3 | 9.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 28.2 |
| | | 25.8 | 29.7 | 29.5 | 42.9 | 0.0 | |
| | | 9.4 | 15.6 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | | 62 | 108 | 20 | 4 | 4 | 198 |
| | | 31.3 | 54.5 | 10.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 39.6 |
| | | 34.1 | 41.1 | 45.5 | 57.1 | 100.0 | |
| | | 12.4 | 21.6 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | | 73 | 77 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| | | 45.3 | 47.8 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.2 |
| | | 40.1 | 29.3 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | 14.6 | 15.4 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 182 | 263 | 44 | 7 | 4 | 500 |
| | | 36.4 | 52.6 | 8.8 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.89618 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0312

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 39

TABLE 64

POSTN BY VAR047

| POSTN | VAR047 STRENGTHENED 1. | 2. NO EFFEC | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 11<br>9.3<br>26.8<br>3.2 | 34<br>28.8<br>32.1<br>9.9 | 73<br>61.9<br>36.9<br>21.2 | 118<br>34.2 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 13<br>8.3<br>31.7<br>3.8 | 56<br>35.9<br>52.8<br>16.2 | 87<br>55.8<br>43.9<br>25.2 | 156<br>45.2 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 17<br>23.9<br>41.5<br>4.9 | 16<br>22.5<br>15.1<br>4.6 | 38<br>53.5<br>19.2<br>11.0 | 71<br>20.6 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 41<br>11.9 | 106<br>30.7 | 198<br>57.4 | 345<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 14.71241 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0053

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 194

TABLE 65

POSTN BY VAR049

| POSTN | VAR049 STRENGTHENED 1. | 2. NO EFFEC | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 5<br>4.2<br>31.3<br>1.5 | 57<br>48.3<br>29.4<br>16.6 | 56<br>47.5<br>42.1<br>16.3 | 118<br>34.4 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 9<br>5.8<br>56.3<br>2.6 | 76<br>49.4<br>39.2<br>22.2 | 69<br>44.8<br>51.9<br>20.1 | 154<br>44.9 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 2<br>2.8<br>12.5<br>0.6 | 61<br>85.9<br>31.4<br>17.8 | 8<br>11.3<br>6.0<br>2.3 | 71<br>20.7 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 16<br>4.7 | 194<br>56.6 | 133<br>38.8 | 343<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 32.27271 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 196

TABLE 66

POSTN BY VAR053

| POSTN | VAR053 STRENGTHENED 1. | 2. NO EFFEC | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 10<br>8.5<br>17.9<br>2.9 | 66<br>56.4<br>40.2<br>19.3 | 41<br>35.0<br>33.3<br>12.0 | 117<br>34.2 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 33<br>21.7<br>60.0<br>10.2 | 72<br>46.9<br>43.9<br>21.1 | 47<br>30.5<br>38.2<br>13.7 | 154<br>45.0 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 11<br>15.5<br>19.6<br>3.2 | 26<br>36.6<br>15.9<br>7.6 | 34<br>47.9<br>27.6<br>9.9 | 71<br>20.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 56<br>16.4 | 164<br>48.0 | 122<br>35.7 | 342<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.02930 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0030

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 197

TABLE 67

POSTN BY VAR059

| POSTN | VAR059 STRENGTHENED 1. | 2. NO EFFEC | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 39<br>33.9<br>41.9<br>11.5 | 43<br>37.1<br>38.7<br>12.7 | 34<br>29.3<br>25.4<br>10.0 | 116<br>34.2 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 40<br>26.3<br>43.0<br>11.8 | 55<br>36.2<br>49.1<br>16.2 | 57<br>37.5<br>42.5<br>16.8 | 152<br>44.8 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 14<br>19.7<br>15.1<br>4.1 | 14<br>19.7<br>12.5<br>4.1 | 43<br>60.6<br>32.1<br>12.7 | 71<br>20.9 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 93<br>27.4 | 112<br>33.0 | 134<br>39.5 | 339<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 19.23683 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0007

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 200

TABLE 68

POSTN BY VAR061

| POSTN | VAR061 STRENGTHENED 1. | NO EFFECT 2. | WEAKENED 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 14<br>12.0<br>25.9<br>4.1 | 73<br>62.4<br>35.3<br>21.3 | 30<br>25.6<br>34.5<br>8.8 | 117<br>34.2 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 24<br>15.2<br>50.0<br>7.0 | 98<br>63.6<br>47.3<br>28.7 | 28<br>18.2<br>32.2<br>8.2 | 154<br>45.0 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 6<br>8.5<br>12.5<br>1.8 | 36<br>50.7<br>17.4<br>10.5 | 29<br>40.8<br>33.3<br>8.5 | 71<br>20.8 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 48<br>14.0 | 207<br>60.5 | 87<br>25.4 | 342<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 15.05109 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0045

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 197

TABLE 69

POSTN BY VAR063

| POSTN | VAR063 STRENGTHENED 1. | NO EFFECT 2. | WEAKENED 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 6<br>5.1<br>27.3<br>1.8 | 64<br>54.7<br>35.2<br>18.8 | 47<br>40.2<br>34.3<br>13.8 | 117<br>34.3 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 12<br>7.8<br>54.5<br>3.5 | 97<br>63.0<br>53.3<br>28.4 | 45<br>29.2<br>32.8<br>13.2 | 154<br>45.2 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 4<br>5.7<br>18.2<br>1.2 | 21<br>30.0<br>11.5<br>6.2 | 45<br>64.3<br>32.8<br>13.2 | 70<br>20.5 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 22<br>6.5 | 182<br>53.4 | 137<br>40.2 | 341<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 25.40431 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 198

TABLE 70

POSTN BY VAR065

| POSTN | VAR065 STRENGTHENED 1. | NO EFFECT 2. | WEAKENED 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 19<br>16.1<br>43.2<br>5.5 | 57<br>48.3<br>39.6<br>16.6 | 42<br>35.6<br>30.7<br>12.2 | 118<br>34.4 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 17<br>11.0<br>38.6<br>5.0 | 82<br>53.2<br>57.0<br>23.9 | 55<br>35.7<br>40.1<br>16.0 | 154<br>44.9 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 11<br>15.5<br>43.4<br>3.2 | 20<br>28.2<br>14.0<br>5.8 | 40<br>56.3<br>29.2<br>11.7 | 71<br>20.7 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 47<br>13.7 | 159<br>46.4 | 137<br>39.9 | 343<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 14.22593 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0066

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 196

TABLE 71

POSTN BY VAR051

| POSTN | VAR051 STRENGTHENED 1. | NO EFFECT 2. | WEAKENED 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 9<br>7.6<br>40.9<br>2.6 | 67<br>56.8<br>30.9<br>19.5 | 42<br>35.6<br>40.4<br>12.2 | 118<br>34.4 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 5<br>3.2<br>22.7<br>1.5 | 109<br>70.8<br>50.2<br>31.8 | 40<br>26.0<br>38.5<br>11.7 | 154<br>44.9 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 8<br>11.3<br>36.4<br>2.3 | 41<br>57.7<br>18.9<br>12.0 | 22<br>31.0<br>21.2<br>6.4 | 71<br>20.7 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 22<br>6.4 | 217<br>63.3 | 104<br>30.3 | 343<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.83954 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0432

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 196

TABLE 72

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR064

| VAR007 | VAR064 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMPORTANT | 5. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. PRIN-UNDER 500 | 8<br>32.0<br>8.3<br>4.7 | 16<br>64.0<br>25.8<br>9.5 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>4.0<br>100.0<br>0.6 | 25<br>14.8 |
| 6. PRIN-400-1000 | 36<br>58.1<br>37.9<br>21.3 | 24<br>38.7<br>38.7<br>14.2 | 2<br>3.2<br>25.0<br>1.2 | 1<br>1.6<br>100.0<br>0.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 62<br>36.7 |
| 7. PRIN-1000-2000 | 40<br>69.0<br>41.7<br>23.7 | 13<br>22.4<br>20.6<br>7.7 | 5<br>8.6<br>62.5<br>3.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 58<br>34.3 |
| 8. PRIN-OVER2000 | 14<br>58.3<br>14.6<br>8.3 | 9<br>37.5<br>14.3<br>5.3 | 1<br>4.2<br>12.5<br>0.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 24<br>14.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 96<br>56.8 | 63<br>37.3 | 8<br>4.7 | 1<br>0.6 | 1<br>0.6 | 169<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 23.48617 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0239

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 73

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR062

| VAR007 | VAR062 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMPORTANT | 5. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. PRIN-UNDER 500 | 2<br>8.0<br>3.6<br>1.2 | 19<br>76.0<br>20.7<br>11.3 | 2<br>8.0<br>10.5<br>1.2 | 1<br>4.0<br>25.0<br>0.6 | 1<br>4.0<br>100.0<br>0.6 | 25<br>14.9 |
| 6. PRIN-400-1000 | 15<br>24.2<br>27.8<br>8.9 | 36<br>58.1<br>39.1<br>21.4 | 8<br>12.9<br>42.1<br>4.8 | 3<br>4.8<br>75.0<br>1.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 62<br>36.9 |
| 7. PRIN-1000-2000 | 27<br>46.6<br>50.0<br>16.1 | 25<br>43.1<br>27.2<br>14.9 | 6<br>10.3<br>31.6<br>3.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 58<br>34.5 |
| 8. PRIN-OVER2000 | 8<br>34.8<br>14.8<br>4.8 | 12<br>52.2<br>13.0<br>7.1 | 3<br>13.0<br>15.8<br>1.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 23<br>13.7 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 52<br>31.0 | 92<br>54.8 | 19<br>11.3 | 4<br>2.4 | 1<br>0.6 | 168<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 23.47618 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0239

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

TABLE 74

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR052

| VAR007 | VAR052 1. VERY IMPORTANT | 2. RELATIVELY IMP | 3. NEUTRAL | 4. RELATIVELY UNIMP | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. PRIN-UNDER 500 | 14<br>56.0<br>12.4<br>8.3 | 10<br>40.0<br>20.4<br>6.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>4.0<br>100.0<br>0.6 | 25<br>14.9 |
| 6. PRIN-400-1000 | 34<br>54.8<br>30.1<br>20.2 | 25<br>40.3<br>51.0<br>14.9 | 3<br>4.8<br>60.0<br>1.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 62<br>36.9 |
| 7. PRIN-1000-2000 | 47<br>81.0<br>41.6<br>28.0 | 8<br>14.0<br>16.3<br>4.8 | 2<br>3.5<br>40.0<br>1.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 57<br>33.9 |
| 8. PRIN-OVER2000 | 18<br>75.0<br>15.9<br>10.7 | 6<br>25.0<br>12.2<br>3.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 24<br>14.3 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 113<br>67.3 | 49<br>29.2 | 5<br>3.0 | 1<br>0.6 | 168<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 20.28833 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0162

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

TABLE 75

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR063

| VAR007 | VAR063 1. STRENGTHENED | 2. NO EFFEC T | 3. WEAKENED | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUP-UNDER 400 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>100.0<br>3.1<br>1.7 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>1.7 |
| 2. SUP-400-5000 | 2<br>2.4<br>40.0<br>1.7 | 52<br>62.4<br>80.3<br>45.2 | 29<br>34.9<br>69.0<br>25.2 | 83<br>72.3 |
| 3. SUP-5000-15000 | 1<br>4.8<br>20.0<br>0.9 | 8<br>38.1<br>12.5<br>7.0 | 12<br>57.1<br>28.1<br>10.4 | 21<br>18.3 |
| 4. SUP-OVER 15000 | 2<br>20.0<br>40.0<br>1.7 | 2<br>20.0<br>3.1<br>1.7 | 6<br>60.0<br>14.3<br>5.2 | 10<br>8.7 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 5<br>4.3 | 64<br>55.7 | 49<br>42.6 | 115<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 15.50421 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0167

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 38

TABLE 76

VAR035 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR048

| VAR035 | VAR048 | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUBLIC | 1. | 133<br>66.5<br>94.3<br>62.8 | 74<br>39.2<br>90.2<br>37.0 | 8<br>4.2<br>100.0<br>4.0 | 4<br>2.1<br>100.0<br>2.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 189<br>94.5 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 2. | 8<br>72.7<br>5.7<br>4.0 | 8<br>72.7<br>9.8<br>4.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>9.1<br>100.0<br>0.5 | 11<br>5.5 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 141<br>70.5 | 82<br>41.0 | 8<br>4.0 | 4<br>2.0 | 1<br>0.5 | 200<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 23.30935 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 77

YEARS BY VAR058

| YEARS | VAR058 | 1. | 2. | 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 3 | 1. | 1<br>6.3<br>25.0<br>1.5 | 3<br>50.0<br>42.1<br>12.5 | 7<br>43.8<br>16.7<br>10.8 | 16<br>24.6 |
| 4 - 6 | 2. | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 8<br>44.4<br>42.1<br>12.3 | 10<br>55.6<br>23.8<br>15.4 | 18<br>27.7 |
| OVER 6 | 3. | 3<br>9.7<br>75.0<br>4.6 | 3<br>9.7<br>15.8<br>4.6 | 25<br>80.6<br>59.5<br>38.5 | 31<br>47.7 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 4<br>6.2 | 19<br>29.2 | 42<br>64.6 | 65<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.11399 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0165

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 110

TABLE 78

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAF BY VAR059

| VAR004 | VAR059 | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 33<br>49.3<br>33.7<br>16.5 | 30<br>43.5<br>44.9<br>15.0 | 7<br>10.1<br>22.6<br>3.5 | 1<br>1.4<br>25.0<br>0.5 | 69<br>43.1 |
| NO | 2. | 24<br>26.4<br>66.6<br>12.0 | 40<br>44.0<br>57.1<br>20.0 | 24<br>26.4<br>77.4<br>12.0 | 3<br>3.3<br>75.0<br>1.5 | 91<br>56.9 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 57<br>35.6 | 70<br>43.8 | 31<br>19.4 | 4<br>2.5 | 160<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.90239 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0203

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 15

TABLE 79

POSTN BY VAR077

| POSTN | VAR077 | 1. | 2. | 3. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUPERINTENDENTS | 1. | 1<br>0.9<br>11.1<br>0.5 | 58<br>50.0<br>34.5<br>17.1 | 57<br>49.1<br>35.0<br>16.8 | 116<br>34.1 |
| PRINCIPALS | 2. | 8<br>5.3<br>88.9<br>2.4 | 79<br>52.0<br>47.0<br>23.2 | 65<br>42.8<br>39.9<br>19.1 | 152<br>44.7 |
| J.C. PRESIDENTS | 3. | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 31<br>43.1<br>18.5<br>9.1 | 41<br>56.9<br>25.2<br>12.1 | 72<br>21.2 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 9<br>2.6 | 168<br>49.4 | 163<br>47.9 | 340<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.13294 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0382

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 199

TABLE 80

POSTN BY VAR116

| POSTN | VAR116 1. POSITIVE EFFECT | 2. NO EFFECT | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 13<br>11.8<br>39.4<br>3.9 | 70<br>63.6<br>37.0<br>21.0 | 27<br>24.5<br>27.6<br>8.1 | 110<br>33.0 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 23<br>15.2<br>60.0<br>6.9 | 61<br>40.4<br>32.3<br>18.3 | 37<br>24.5<br>37.8<br>11.1 | 151<br>45.3 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 13<br>18.1<br>39.4<br>3.9 | 28<br>38.9<br>14.8<br>8.4 | 31<br>43.1<br>31.7<br>9.3 | 72<br>21.6 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 49<br>14.7 | 189<br>56.8 | 98<br>29.4 | 333<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 15.71399 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0034

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 206

TABLE 81

POSTN BY VAR131

| POSTN | VAR131 1. POSITIVE EFFECT | 2. NO EFFECT | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 13<br>11.3<br>36.1<br>3.9 | 5<br>4.3<br>12.2<br>1.5 | 97<br>84.3<br>37.2<br>29.0 | 115<br>34.1 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 20<br>13.2<br>55.6<br>5.9 | 27<br>17.7<br>65.9<br>8.0 | 104<br>68.9<br>40.0<br>31.1 | 151<br>44.8 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 3<br>4.2<br>8.3<br>0.9 | 9<br>12.7<br>22.0<br>2.7 | 59<br>83.1<br>22.7<br>17.6 | 71<br>21.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 36<br>10.7 | 41<br>12.2 | 260<br>77.2 | 337<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.02571 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0031

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 202

TABLE 82

POSTN BY VAR137

| POSTN | VAR137 1. POSITIVE EFFECT | 2. NO EFFECT | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 37<br>32.5<br>25.9<br>10.9 | 33<br>28.9<br>36.3<br>9.7 | 44<br>38.6<br>44.4<br>13.0 | 114<br>33.5 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 77<br>50.7<br>53.8<br>22.7 | 49<br>32.2<br>53.8<br>14.4 | 30<br>19.1<br>30.3<br>8.8 | 153<br>45.1 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 29<br>40.3<br>20.3<br>8.6 | 9<br>12.5<br>9.9<br>2.7 | 34<br>47.2<br>34.3<br>10.0 | 72<br>21.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 143<br>42.2 | 91<br>26.8 | 99<br>29.2 | 339<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 14.43907 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0059

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 200

TABLE 83

POSTN BY VAR104

| POSTN | VAR104 1. POSITIVE EFFECT | 2. NO EFFECT | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 26<br>23.0<br>25.7<br>7.7 | 20<br>17.7<br>22.0<br>5.9 | 67<br>59.3<br>47.9<br>19.8 | 113<br>33.4 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 51<br>33.3<br>49.5<br>15.1 | 48<br>31.4<br>52.7<br>14.2 | 54<br>35.3<br>38.6<br>16.0 | 153<br>45.3 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 26<br>36.1<br>25.2<br>7.7 | 23<br>31.9<br>25.3<br>6.8 | 23<br>31.9<br>16.4<br>6.8 | 72<br>21.3 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 103<br>30.5 | 91<br>26.9 | 144<br>42.6 | 338<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.93620 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0020

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 201

TABLE 84

POSTN BY VAR113

| POSTN | VAR113 1. POSITIVE EFFECT | 2. NO EFFEC | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUPERINTENDENTS | 7<br>6.3<br>25.9<br>2.1 | 28<br>25.0<br>21.2<br>8.4 | 77<br>68.8<br>43.8<br>23.0 | 112<br>33.4 |
| 2. PRINCIPALS | 11<br>7.2<br>40.7<br>3.3 | 70<br>46.0<br>53.0<br>20.9 | 67<br>44.0<br>38.1<br>20.0 | 152<br>45.4 |
| 3. J.C.PRESIDENTS | 9<br>12.7<br>33.3<br>2.7 | 34<br>47.9<br>25.8<br>10.1 | 28<br>39.4<br>15.9<br>8.4 | 71<br>21.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 27<br>8.1 | 132<br>39.4 | 176<br>52.5 | 335<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 24.36787 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 204

TABLE 85

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR084

| VAR007 | VAR084 1. VERY CRI TICAL PR | 2. IMPORTAN T PROBLE | 3. OCCASION AL PROB. | 4. MINOR PR OBLEM | 5. NOT A PR OBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PRIN-UNDER 500 | 3<br>11.5<br>6.3<br>1.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>7.7<br>7.4<br>1.2 | 5<br>19.2<br>20.8<br>3.0 | 16<br>61.5<br>23.1<br>10.7 | 26<br>15.4 |
| 6. PRIN-400-1000 | 5<br>8.3<br>10.4<br>3.0 | 7<br>11.7<br>29.2<br>4.1 | 11<br>18.3<br>40.7<br>6.5 | 7<br>11.7<br>29.2<br>4.1 | 32<br>53.3<br>47.8<br>19.0 | 60<br>35.5 |
| 7. PRIN-1000-2000 | 9<br>13.6<br>50.0<br>4.7 | 10<br>15.2<br>41.7<br>5.9 | 10<br>15.2<br>37.0<br>5.9 | 9<br>13.6<br>37.5<br>5.3 | 28<br>42.4<br>37.3<br>16.6 | 59<br>34.9 |
| 8. PRIN-OVER 2000 | 4<br>16.7<br>22.2<br>2.4 | 7<br>29.2<br>29.2<br>4.1 | 4<br>16.7<br>14.8<br>2.4 | 3<br>12.5<br>12.5<br>1.8 | 6<br>25.0<br>8.7<br>3.6 | 24<br>14.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 16<br>9.5 | 24<br>14.2 | 27<br>16.0 | 24<br>14.2 | 78<br>46.2 | 169<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 21.75122 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0404

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 86

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR093

| VAR007 | VAR093 1. VERY CRI TICAL PR | 2. IMPORTAN T PROBLE | 3. OCCASION AL PROB. | 4. MINOR PR OBLEM | 5. NOT A PR OBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUP-UNDER 400 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>100.0<br>10.5<br>1.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>1.4 |
| 2. SUP-400-5000 | 17<br>16.2<br>70.8<br>12.0 | 30<br>28.6<br>81.1<br>21.1 | 29<br>27.6<br>87.9<br>20.4 | 12<br>11.4<br>63.2<br>8.5 | 7<br>6.7<br>100.0<br>4.9 | 105<br>73.9 |
| 3. SUP-5000-15000 | 4<br>16.0<br>16.7<br>2.8 | 3<br>12.0<br>8.1<br>2.1 | 3<br>12.0<br>9.1<br>2.1 | 5<br>20.0<br>26.3<br>3.5 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 25<br>17.6 |
| 4. SUP-OVER 15000 | 3<br>30.0<br>12.5<br>2.1 | 4<br>40.0<br>10.8<br>2.8 | 1<br>10.0<br>3.0<br>0.7 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>7.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 24<br>16.9 | 37<br>26.1 | 33<br>23.2 | 19<br>13.4 | 7<br>4.9 | 142<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 30.27315 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0025

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

TABLE 87

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR095

| VAR007 | VAR095 1. VERY CRI TICAL PR | 2. IMPORTAN T PROBLE | 3. OCCASION AL PROB. | 4. MINOR PR OBLEM | 5. NOT A PR OBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUP-UNDER 400 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>50.0<br>6.3<br>0.7 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>50.0<br>25.0<br>0.7 | 2<br>1.4 |
| 2. SUP-400-5000 | 27<br>26.0<br>75.0<br>19.1 | 35<br>33.7<br>76.1<br>24.8 | 25<br>24.0<br>67.6<br>17.7 | 15<br>14.4<br>83.3<br>10.6 | 2<br>1.9<br>50.0<br>1.4 | 104<br>73.8 |
| 3. SUP-5000-15000 | 7<br>28.0<br>19.4<br>5.0 | 7<br>28.0<br>15.2<br>5.0 | 8<br>32.0<br>21.6<br>5.7 | 3<br>12.0<br>16.7<br>2.1 | 1<br>4.0<br>25.0<br>0.7 | 25<br>17.7 |
| 4. SUP-OVER 15000 | 2<br>20.0<br>5.6<br>1.4 | 4<br>40.0<br>8.7<br>2.8 | 4<br>40.0<br>10.8<br>2.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>7.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 36<br>25.5 | 46<br>32.6 | 37<br>26.2 | 18<br>12.8 | 4<br>2.8 | 141<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 21.55549 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0427

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 12

TABLE 88

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR100

| VAR007 | VAR100 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUP-UNDER 400 1. | 1<br>50.0<br>3.2<br>0.7 | 1<br>50.0<br>2.4<br>0.7 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>1.4 |
| SUP-400-5000 2. | 27<br>19.9<br>60.0<br>19.0 | 29<br>21.3<br>69.0<br>20.4 | 24<br>23.4<br>80.0<br>16.9 | 20<br>19.0<br>90.9<br>14.1 | 15<br>14.3<br>83.3<br>10.6 | 105<br>73.9 |
| SUP-5000-15000 3. | 5<br>24.0<br>16.1<br>3.2 | 9<br>36.0<br>22.0<br>6.3 | 6<br>24.0<br>20.0<br>4.2 | 2<br>8.0<br>9.1<br>1.4 | 2<br>8.0<br>11.1<br>1.4 | 25<br>17.6 |
| SUP-OVER 15000 4. | 7<br>70.0<br>22.6<br>4.9 | 2<br>20.0<br>4.9<br>1.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>10.0<br>5.9<br>0.7 | 10<br>7.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 31<br>21.8 | 41<br>28.9 | 30<br>21.1 | 22<br>15.5 | 18<br>12.7 | 142<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 21.37715 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0451

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

TABLE 89

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR094

| VAR007 | VAR094 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUP-UNDER 400 1. | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>100.0<br>0.8<br>0.7 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>0.7 |
| SUP-400-5000 2. | 7<br>6.8<br>49.7<br>5.0 | 10<br>9.7<br>83.7<br>7.2 | 13<br>12.5<br>76.2<br>9.4 | 11<br>10.7<br>73.3<br>7.9 | 62<br>60.2<br>81.6<br>44.6 | 103<br>74.1 |
| SUP-5000-15000 3. | 3<br>12.0<br>20.0<br>2.2 | 5<br>20.0<br>33.3<br>3.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 3<br>12.0<br>20.0<br>2.2 | 14<br>56.0<br>18.4<br>10.1 | 25<br>18.0 |
| SUP-OVER 15000 4. | 5<br>50.0<br>62.5<br>3.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 4<br>40.0<br>30.8<br>2.9 | 1<br>10.0<br>9.1<br>0.7 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>7.2 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 15<br>10.8 | 15<br>10.8 | 13<br>12.9 | 15<br>10.8 | 76<br>54.7 | 139<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 40.66743 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0001

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 14

TABLE 90

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR095

| VAR007 | VAR095 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUP-UNDER 400 1. | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>100.0<br>2.5<br>1.5 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 2<br>1.5 |
| SUP-400-5000 2. | 9<br>9.4<br>47.4<br>6.7 | 18<br>18.9<br>90.0<br>13.7 | 55<br>57.9<br>78.4<br>42.0 | 2<br>2.1<br>66.7<br>1.5 | 12<br>12.6<br>85.7<br>9.2 | 95<br>72.5 |
| SUP-5000-15000 3. | 3<br>12.5<br>50.0<br>2.3 | 2<br>8.3<br>8.0<br>1.5 | 14<br>58.3<br>16.4<br>10.7 | 1<br>4.2<br>33.3<br>0.8 | 2<br>8.3<br>14.3<br>1.5 | 24<br>18.3 |
| SUP-OVER 15000 4. | 4<br>40.0<br>23.5<br>3.1 | 5<br>50.0<br>20.0<br>3.8 | 1<br>10.0<br>1.4<br>0.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>7.6 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 17<br>13.0 | 25<br>19.1 | 72<br>55.0 | 3<br>2.3 | 14<br>10.7 | 131<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 22.42776 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0332

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 22

TABLE 91

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR098

| VAR007 | VAR098 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SUP-UNDER 400 1. | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>50.0<br>1.7<br>0.7 | 1<br>50.0<br>33.3<br>0.7 | 2<br>1.6 |
| SUP-400-5000 2. | 14<br>14.4<br>87.5<br>10.4 | 37<br>38.1<br>78.7<br>27.9 | 44<br>45.4<br>73.3<br>32.8 | 2<br>2.1<br>66.7<br>1.5 | 97<br>72.4 |
| SUP-5000-15000 3. | 4<br>16.0<br>13.3<br>3.0 | 9<br>36.0<br>18.8<br>6.7 | 12<br>48.0<br>20.0<br>8.9 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 25<br>18.7 |
| SUP-OVER 15000 4. | 3<br>30.0<br>14.3<br>2.2 | 4<br>40.0<br>8.5<br>3.0 | 3<br>30.0<br>5.0<br>2.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>7.5 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 21<br>15.7 | 50<br>37.3 | 60<br>44.8 | 3<br>2.2 | 134<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 24.25566 WITH 9 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0039

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 19

TABLE 92

VAR007 SIZE OF SCHOOL OR DISTRICT BY VAR101

| VAR007 | VAR101 1. POSITIVE NO EFFECT | 2. | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. SUP-UNDER 400 | 1 / 100.0 / 7.1 / 0.9 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 1 / 0.9 |
| 2. SUP-400-5000 | 9 / 11.4 / 64.3 / 8.1 | 35 / 44.3 / 83.3 / 31.5 | 35 / 44.3 / 63.6 / 31.5 | 79 / 71.2 |
| 3. SUP-5000-15000 | 4 / 19.0 / 28.6 / 3.6 | 5 / 23.8 / 11.9 / 4.5 | 12 / 57.1 / 21.8 / 10.8 | 21 / 18.9 |
| 5. SUP-OVER 15000 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 2 / 20.0 / 4.8 / 1.8 | 8 / 80.0 / 14.5 / 7.2 | 10 / 9.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 14 / 12.6 | 42 / 37.8 | 55 / 49.5 | 111 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 14.33120 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0261

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 42

TABLE 93

VAR003 SIZE OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR092

| VAR003 | VAR092 1. VERY CRI TICAL PROBL | 2. IMPORTA NT PROBLM | 3. OCCASION AL PROBM | 4. MINOR PR OBLM | 5. NOT PRSN T PROBLM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. UNDER 500 | 3 / 37.5 / 13.6 / 1.9 | 3 / 37.5 / 8.8 / 1.9 | 2 / 25.0 / 7.4 / 1.3 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 8 / 5.0 |
| 2. 500-1000 | 9 / 34.6 / 40.9 / 5.7 | 8 / 30.8 / 22.2 / 5.0 | 4 / 15.4 / 14.8 / 2.5 | 2 / 7.7 / 8.3 / 1.3 | 3 / 11.5 / 6.0 / 1.9 | 26 / 16.4 |
| 3. 1000-3000 | 6 / 12.0 / 27.3 / 3.8 | 9 / 18.0 / 25.0 / 5.7 | 9 / 18.0 / 33.3 / 5.7 | 8 / 16.0 / 33.3 / 5.0 | 18 / 36.0 / 36.0 / 11.3 | 50 / 31.4 |
| 4. 3000-5000 | 1 / 5.0 / 4.5 / 0.6 | 7 / 35.0 / 19.4 / 4.4 | 2 / 10.0 / 7.4 / 1.3 | 4 / 20.0 / 16.7 / 2.5 | 6 / 30.0 / 12.0 / 3.8 | 20 / 12.6 |
| 5. OVER 5000 | 3 / 5.5 / 13.6 / 1.9 | 9 / 16.4 / 25.0 / 5.7 | 10 / 18.2 / 37.0 / 6.3 | 10 / 18.2 / 41.7 / 6.3 | 23 / 41.8 / 46.0 / 14.5 | 55 / 34.6 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 22 / 13.8 | 36 / 22.6 | 27 / 17.0 | 24 / 15.1 | 50 / 31.4 | 159 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 31.56976 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0114

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 16

TABLE 94

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR120

| VAR005 | VAR120 1. VERY CRI TICAL PR | 2. IMPORTAN T PROBLE | 3. OCCASION AL PROB. | 4. MINOR PR OBLEM | 5. NOT A PR OBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC | 63 / 32.8 / 96.4 / 31.0 | 67 / 34.9 / 98.5 / 33.0 | 40 / 20.8 / 88.9 / 19.7 | 16 / 8.3 / 84.2 / 7.9 | 6 / 3.1 / 85.7 / 3.0 | 192 / 94.6 |
| 2. NON-PUBLIC | 1 / 9.1 / 1.6 / 0.5 | 1 / 9.1 / 1.5 / 0.5 | 5 / 45.5 / 11.1 / 2.5 | 3 / 27.3 / 15.8 / 1.5 | 1 / 9.1 / 14.3 / 0.5 | 11 / 5.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 64 / 31.5 | 68 / 33.5 | 45 / 22.2 | 19 / 9.4 | 7 / 3.4 | 203 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 11.53136 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0187

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 95

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR111

| VAR005 | VAR111 1. VERY CRI TICAL PR | 2. IMPORTAN T PROBLE | 3. OCCASION AL PROB. | 4. MINOR PR OBLEM | 5. NOT A PR OBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC | 45 / 23.4 / 95.7 / 22.2 | 61 / 31.8 / 100.0 / 30.0 | 45 / 23.4 / 95.7 / 22.2 | 22 / 11.5 / 95.7 / 10.8 | 19 / 9.9 / 76.0 / 9.4 | 192 / 94.6 |
| 2. NON-PUBLIC | 2 / 18.2 / 4.3 / 1.0 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 2 / 18.2 / 4.3 / 1.0 | 1 / 9.1 / 4.3 / 0.5 | 6 / 54.5 / 24.0 / 3.0 | 11 / 5.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 47 / 23.2 | 61 / 30.0 | 47 / 23.2 | 23 / 11.3 | 25 / 12.3 | 203 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 20.63634 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0004

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 96

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR081

| VAR005 | VAR081 1. VERY CRITICAL PROBLEM | 2. IMPORTANT BUT NOT CRITICAL PROBLEM | 3. OCCASIONAL PROBLEM | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC | 45<br>23.3<br>95.7<br>22.1 | 90<br>46.6<br>98.9<br>44.1 | 39<br>20.2<br>86.7<br>19.1 | 10<br>5.2<br>90.9<br>4.9 | 9<br>4.7<br>90.0<br>4.4 | 193<br>94.6 |
| 2. NON-PUBLIC | 2<br>18.2<br>4.3<br>1.0 | 1<br>9.1<br>1.1<br>0.5 | 6<br>54.5<br>13.3<br>2.9 | 1<br>9.1<br>9.1<br>0.5 | 1<br>9.1<br>10.0<br>0.5 | 11<br>5.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 47<br>23.0 | 91<br>44.6 | 45<br>22.1 | 11<br>5.4 | 10<br>4.9 | 204<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.66101 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0462

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 97

VAR005 CONTROL DISRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR121

| VAR005 | VAR121 1. BECOME MUCH MORE | 2. BECOME SLIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANGE | 4. BECOM SLIGHTLY L | 5. BECOME MUCH LESS | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC | 66<br>34.7<br>97.1<br>33.0 | 62<br>32.6<br>100.0<br>31.0 | 51<br>26.8<br>86.4<br>25.5 | 10<br>5.3<br>100.0<br>5.0 | 1<br>0.5<br>100.0<br>0.5 | 190<br>95.0 |
| 2. NON-PUBLIC | 2<br>20.0<br>2.9<br>1.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 8<br>80.0<br>13.6<br>4.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>5.0 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 68<br>34.0 | 62<br>31.0 | 59<br>29.5 | 10<br>5.0 | 1<br>0.5 | 200<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 13.54682 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0089

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

TABLE 98

VAR005 CONTROL DISRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR112

| VAR005 | VAR112 1. BECOME MUCH MORE | 2. BECOME SLIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANG E | 4. BECOM SLIGHTLY L | 5. BECOME MUCH LESS | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC | 68<br>36.2<br>97.1<br>34.3 | 65<br>34.6<br>100.0<br>32.8 | 52<br>27.7<br>86.1<br>26.3 | 2<br>1.1<br>66.7<br>1.0 | 1<br>0.5<br>100.0<br>0.5 | 188<br>94.9 |
| 2. NON-PUBLIC | 2<br>20.0<br>2.9<br>1.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 7<br>70.0<br>11.9<br>3.5 | 1<br>10.0<br>33.3<br>0.5 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>5.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 70<br>35.4 | 65<br>32.8 | 59<br>29.8 | 3<br>1.5 | 1<br>0.5 | 198<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 14.92951 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0048

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 9

TABLE 99

VAR005 CONTROL DISRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR082

| VAR005 | VAR082 1. BECOME MUCH MORE | 2. BECOME SLIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANG E | 4. BECOM SLIGHTLY L | 5. BECOME MUCH LESS | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. PUBLIC | 75<br>40.1<br>98.7<br>38.1 | 75<br>40.1<br>97.4<br>38.1 | 33<br>17.6<br>82.5<br>16.8 | 2<br>1.1<br>100.0<br>1.0 | 2<br>1.1<br>100.0<br>1.0 | 187<br>94.9 |
| 2. NON-PUBLIC | 1<br>10.0<br>1.3<br>0.5 | 2<br>20.0<br>2.6<br>1.0 | 7<br>70.0<br>17.5<br>3.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>5.1 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 76<br>38.6 | 77<br>39.1 | 40<br>20.3 | 2<br>1.0 | 2<br>1.0 | 197<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.23940 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0027

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

TABLE 100

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR093

| VAR005 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR093 1. VERY CRITICAL PROBLEM | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLEM | 3. OCCASIONAL PROBLEM | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUBLIC | 1. | 37 / 19.2 / 94.9 / 18.1 | 79 / 40.9 / 98.8 / 38.7 | 48 / 24.9 / 94.1 / 23.5 | 22 / 11.4 / 88.0 / 10.8 | 7 / 3.6 / 77.8 / 3.4 | 193 / 94.6 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 2. | 2 / 18.2 / 5.1 / 1.0 | 1 / 9.1 / 1.3 / 0.5 | 3 / 27.3 / 5.9 / 1.5 | 3 / 27.3 / 12.0 / 1.5 | 2 / 18.2 / 22.2 / 1.0 | 11 / 5.4 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 39 / 19.1 | 80 / 39.2 | 51 / 25.0 | 25 / 12.3 | 9 / 4.4 | 204 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.85693 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0429

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 101

VAR005 CONTROL DISTRICT OR SCHOOL BY VAR096

| VAR005 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR096 1. VERY CRITICAL PROBLEM | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLEM | 3. OCCASIONAL PROBLEM | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PUBLIC | 1. | 31 / 16.1 / 96.9 / 15.3 | 56 / 29.2 / 96.6 / 27.6 | 50 / 26.0 / 98.0 / 24.6 | 35 / 18.2 / 94.6 / 17.2 | 20 / 10.4 / 80.0 / 9.9 | 192 / 94.6 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 2. | 1 / 9.1 / 3.1 / 0.5 | 2 / 18.2 / 3.4 / 1.0 | 1 / 9.1 / 2.0 / 0.5 | 2 / 18.2 / 5.4 / 1.0 | 5 / 45.5 / 20.0 / 2.5 | 11 / 5.4 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 32 / 15.8 | 58 / 28.6 | 51 / 25.1 | 37 / 18.2 | 25 / 12.3 | 203 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.32899 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0151

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 102

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR095

| VAR001 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR095 1. VERY CRITICAL PROBLEM | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLEM | 3. OCCASIONAL PROBLEM | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT PRSNT PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STATE | 1. | 6 / 15.4 / 12.8 / 3.7 | 14 / 35.9 / 20.0 / 8.6 | 5 / 12.8 / 41.7 / 3.1 | 6 / 15.4 / 35.3 / 3.7 | 8 / 20.5 / 50.0 / 4.9 | 39 / 24.1 |
| LOCAL | 2. | 41 / 36.9 / 87.2 / 25.3 | 49 / 44.1 / 70.0 / 30.2 | 7 / 6.3 / 58.3 / 4.3 | 10 / 9.0 / 58.8 / 6.2 | 4 / 3.6 / 25.0 / 2.5 | 111 / 68.5 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 3. | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 7 / 58.3 / 10.0 / 4.3 | 0 / 0.0 / 0.0 / 0.0 | 1 / 8.3 / 5.9 / 0.6 | 4 / 33.3 / 25.0 / 2.5 | 12 / 7.4 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 47 / 29.0 | 70 / 43.2 | 12 / 7.4 | 17 / 10.5 | 16 / 9.9 | 162 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 28.38434 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0005

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

TABLE 103

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR071

| VAR001 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR071 1. VERY CRITICAL PROBLEM | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLEM | 3. OCCASIONAL PROBLEM | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT PRSNT PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STATE | 1. | 3 / 7.7 / 12.5 / 1.9 | 15 / 38.5 / 23.4 / 9.3 | 15 / 38.5 / 27.8 / 9.3 | 3 / 7.7 / 30.0 / 1.9 | 3 / 7.7 / 30.0 / 1.9 | 39 / 24.1 |
| LOCAL | 2. | 20 / 18.0 / 83.3 / 12.3 | 44 / 39.6 / 68.8 / 27.2 | 38 / 34.2 / 70.4 / 23.5 | 5 / 4.5 / 50.0 / 3.1 | 4 / 3.6 / 40.0 / 2.5 | 111 / 68.5 |
| NON-PUBLIC | 3. | 1 / 8.3 / 4.2 / 0.6 | 5 / 41.7 / 7.8 / 3.1 | 1 / 8.3 / 1.9 / 0.6 | 2 / 16.7 / 20.0 / 1.2 | 3 / 25.0 / 30.0 / 1.9 | 12 / 7.4 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 24 / 14.8 | 64 / 39.5 | 54 / 33.3 | 10 / 6.2 | 10 / 6.2 | 162 / 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.06538 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0415

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

TABLE 104

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR076

| VAR001 | VAR076 1. POSITIVE EFFECT | 2. NO EFFECT | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. STATE | 5<br>45.5<br>41.7<br>7.1 | 3<br>27.3<br>13.0<br>4.3 | 3<br>27.3<br>8.6<br>4.3 | 11<br>15.7 |
| 2. LOCAL | 7<br>11.9<br>58.3<br>10.0 | 20<br>33.9<br>87.0<br>28.6 | 32<br>54.2<br>91.4<br>45.7 | 59<br>84.3 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 12<br>17.1 | 23<br>32.9 | 35<br>50.0 | 70<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 7.57431 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0227

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 105

TABLE 105

VAR001 CONTROL OF YOUR COLLEGE BY VAR109

| VAR001 | VAR109 1. POSITIVE EFFECT | 2. NO EFFECT | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. STATE | 4<br>33.3<br>50.0<br>5.6 | 4<br>33.3<br>15.4<br>5.6 | 4<br>33.3<br>10.5<br>5.5 | 12<br>16.7 |
| 2. LOCAL | 4<br>6.7<br>50.0<br>5.6 | 22<br>36.7<br>84.6<br>30.6 | 34<br>56.7<br>89.5<br>47.2 | 60<br>83.3 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 8<br>11.1 | 26<br>36.1 | 38<br>52.3 | 72<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 7.46235 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0240

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 103

TABLE 106

YEARS BY VAR082

| YEARS | VAR082 1. BECOME M UCH MORE | 2. BECOME S LIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANG E | 4. BECOM SL IGHTLY L | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 3 | 13<br>44.8<br>26.5<br>10.2 | 15<br>51.7<br>26.8<br>11.8 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>3.4<br>100.0<br>0.8 | 29<br>22.8 |
| 4 - 6 | 16<br>47.1<br>32.7<br>12.6 | 15<br>44.1<br>26.8<br>11.8 | 3<br>8.8<br>14.3<br>2.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 34<br>26.8 |
| OVER 6 | 20<br>31.3<br>40.8<br>15.7 | 26<br>40.6<br>46.5<br>20.5 | 18<br>28.1<br>85.7<br>14.2 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 64<br>50.4 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 49<br>38.6 | 56<br>44.1 | 21<br>16.5 | 1<br>0.8 | 127<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.97191 WITH 6 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0094

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 80

TABLE 107

YEARS BY VAR083

| YEARS | VAR083 1. POSITIVE EFFECT | 2. NO EFFECT | 3. DETRIMENTAL EFFE | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 3 | 5<br>16.1<br>41.7<br>3.9 | 3<br>9.7<br>8.6<br>2.4 | 23<br>74.2<br>28.3<br>18.1 | 31<br>24.4 |
| 4 - 6 | 2<br>6.1<br>16.7<br>1.6 | 8<br>24.2<br>22.9<br>6.3 | 23<br>69.7<br>28.3<br>18.1 | 33<br>26.0 |
| OVER 6 | 5<br>7.9<br>41.7<br>3.9 | 24<br>38.1<br>68.6<br>18.9 | 34<br>54.0<br>42.5<br>26.3 | 63<br>49.6 |
| COLUMN TOTAL | 12<br>9.4 | 35<br>27.6 | 80<br>63.0 | 127<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.95110 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0413

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 80

TABLE 108

YEARS BY VAR087

| YEARS | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR087 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 3 | 1. | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 4<br>22.2<br>12.9<br>3.7 | 8<br>44.4<br>18.6<br>7.4 | 6<br>33.3<br>30.0<br>5.6 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 18<br>16.7 |
| 4 - 6 | 2. | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 7<br>28.0<br>22.6<br>6.5 | 8<br>32.0<br>18.6<br>7.4 | 5<br>20.0<br>25.0<br>4.6 | 5<br>20.0<br>83.3<br>4.6 | 25<br>23.1 |
| OVER 6 | 3. | 8<br>12.3<br>100.0<br>7.4 | 20<br>30.8<br>64.5<br>18.5 | 27<br>41.5<br>62.8<br>25.0 | 9<br>13.8<br>45.0<br>8.3 | 1<br>1.5<br>16.7<br>0.9 | 65<br>60.2 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 8<br>7.4 | 31<br>28.7 | 43<br>39.8 | 20<br>18.5 | 6<br>5.6 | 108<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 21.39166 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0062

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 49

TABLE 109

YEARS BY VAR072

| YEARS | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR072 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 3 | 1. | 1<br>5.6<br>3.0<br>0.9 | 11<br>61.1<br>24.4<br>10.0 | 3<br>16.7<br>13.6<br>2.7 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 3<br>16.7<br>60.0<br>2.7 | 18<br>16.4 |
| 4 - 6 | 2. | 7<br>26.9<br>21.2<br>6.4 | 9<br>34.6<br>20.0<br>8.2 | 8<br>30.8<br>36.4<br>7.3 | 1<br>3.8<br>20.0<br>0.9 | 1<br>3.8<br>20.0<br>0.9 | 26<br>23.6 |
| OVER 6 | 3. | 25<br>37.9<br>75.8<br>22.7 | 25<br>37.9<br>55.6<br>22.7 | 11<br>16.7<br>50.0<br>10.0 | 4<br>6.1<br>80.0<br>3.6 | 1<br>1.5<br>20.0<br>0.9 | 66<br>60.0 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 33<br>30.0 | 45<br>40.9 | 22<br>20.0 | 5<br>4.5 | 5<br>4.5 | 110<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 17.56184 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0248

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 47

TABLE 110

YEARS BY VAR086

| YEARS | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR086 1. VERY CRITICAL PROBL | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLEM | 3. OCCASIONAL PROBLEM | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT PRSNT PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 - 3 | 1. | 1<br>5.9<br>3.3<br>1.5 | 7<br>41.2<br>29.2<br>10.4 | 2<br>11.8<br>11.1<br>3.0 | 7<br>41.2<br>63.6<br>10.4 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 17<br>25.4 |
| 4 - 6 | 2. | 3<br>15.8<br>27.0<br>4.5 | 8<br>42.1<br>33.3<br>11.9 | 5<br>26.3<br>29.4<br>7.5 | 1<br>5.3<br>9.1<br>1.5 | 2<br>10.5<br>66.7<br>3.0 | 19<br>28.4 |
| OVER 6 | 3. | 8<br>25.8<br>66.7<br>11.9 | 9<br>29.0<br>37.5<br>13.4 | 10<br>32.3<br>58.8<br>14.9 | 3<br>9.7<br>27.3<br>4.5 | 1<br>3.2<br>33.3<br>1.5 | 31<br>46.3 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 12<br>17.9 | 24<br>35.8 | 17<br>25.4 | 11<br>16.4 | 3<br>4.5 | 67<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 16.13825 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0404

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 108

TABLE 111

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR087

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR087 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 12<br>7.9<br>80.0<br>6.0 | 58<br>38.4<br>87.9<br>28.9 | 56<br>37.1<br>69.1<br>27.9 | 18<br>11.9<br>66.7<br>9.0 | 7<br>4.6<br>58.3<br>3.5 | 151<br>75.1 |
| NO | 2. | 3<br>6.0<br>20.0<br>1.5 | 8<br>16.0<br>12.1<br>4.0 | 25<br>50.0<br>30.9<br>12.4 | 9<br>18.0<br>33.3<br>4.5 | 5<br>10.0<br>41.7<br>2.5 | 50<br>24.9 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 15<br>7.5 | 66<br>32.8 | 81<br>40.3 | 27<br>13.4 | 12<br>6.0 | 201<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.33446 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0352

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 6

TABLE 112

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR102

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR102 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 25<br>16.3<br>78.1<br>12.3 | 52<br>34.0<br>80.0<br>25.6 | 41<br>26.8<br>87.2<br>20.2 | 17<br>11.1<br>60.7<br>8.4 | 18<br>11.8<br>58.1<br>8.9 | 153<br>75.4 |
| NO | 2. | 7<br>14.0<br>21.9<br>3.4 | 13<br>26.0<br>20.0<br>6.4 | 6<br>12.0<br>12.8<br>3.0 | 11<br>22.0<br>39.3<br>5.4 | 13<br>26.0<br>41.9<br>6.4 | 50<br>24.6 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 32<br>15.8 | 65<br>32.0 | 47<br>23.2 | 28<br>13.8 | 31<br>15.3 | 203<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.68577 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0129

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 113

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR093

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR093 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 36<br>23.5<br>92.3<br>17.6 | 59<br>38.6<br>73.8<br>28.9 | 34<br>22.2<br>66.7<br>16.7 | 20<br>13.1<br>80.0<br>9.8 | 4<br>2.6<br>44.4<br>2.0 | 153<br>75.0 |
| NO | 2. | 3<br>5.9<br>7.7<br>1.5 | 21<br>41.2<br>26.3<br>10.3 | 17<br>33.3<br>33.3<br>8.3 | 5<br>9.8<br>20.0<br>2.5 | 5<br>9.8<br>55.6<br>2.5 | 51<br>25.0 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 39<br>19.1 | 80<br>39.2 | 51<br>25.0 | 25<br>12.3 | 9<br>4.4 | 204<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 13.00113 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0113

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 114

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR108

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR108 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 35<br>23.0<br>85.4<br>17.3 | 46<br>30.3<br>74.2<br>22.8 | 32<br>21.1<br>80.0<br>15.8 | 12<br>7.9<br>50.0<br>5.9 | 27<br>17.8<br>77.1<br>13.4 | 152<br>75.2 |
| NO | 2. | 6<br>12.0<br>14.6<br>3.0 | 16<br>32.0<br>25.8<br>7.9 | 8<br>16.0<br>20.0<br>4.0 | 12<br>24.0<br>50.0<br>5.9 | 8<br>16.0<br>22.9<br>4.0 | 50<br>24.8 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 41<br>20.3 | 62<br>30.7 | 40<br>19.8 | 24<br>11.9 | 35<br>17.3 | 202<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 11.05689 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0259

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

TABLE 115

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR126

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR126 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 23<br>15.0<br>63.9<br>11.3 | 55<br>35.9<br>79.7<br>27.0 | 41<br>26.8<br>70.7<br>20.1 | 23<br>15.0<br>76.7<br>11.3 | 11<br>7.2<br>52.4<br>5.4 | 153<br>75.0 |
| NO | 2. | 13<br>25.5<br>36.1<br>6.4 | 14<br>27.5<br>20.3<br>6.9 | 17<br>33.3<br>29.3<br>8.3 | 7<br>13.7<br>23.3<br>3.4 | 10<br>19.6<br>47.6<br>4.9 | 51<br>25.0 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 36<br>17.7 | 69<br>33.8 | 58<br>28.4 | 30<br>14.7 | 21<br>10.3 | 204<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.67855 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0462

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 116

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR111

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR111 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 39<br>25.7<br>83.0<br>19.2 | 47<br>30.9<br>77.0<br>23.2 | 38<br>25.0<br>80.9<br>18.7 | 15<br>9.9<br>65.2<br>7.4 | 13<br>8.6<br>52.0<br>6.4 | 152<br>74.9 |
| NO | 2. | 8<br>15.7<br>17.0<br>3.9 | 14<br>27.5<br>23.0<br>6.9 | 9<br>17.6<br>19.1<br>4.4 | 8<br>15.7<br>34.8<br>3.9 | 12<br>23.5<br>48.0<br>5.9 | 51<br>25.1 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 47<br>23.2 | 61<br>30.0 | 47<br>23.2 | 23<br>11.3 | 25<br>12.3 | 203<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 10.78079 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0291

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 117

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR090

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR090 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 45<br>29.4<br>86.5<br>22.1 | 56<br>36.6<br>84.8<br>27.5 | 32<br>20.9<br>57.1<br>15.7 | 16<br>10.5<br>69.0<br>7.8 | 4<br>2.6<br>80.0<br>2.0 | 153<br>75.0 |
| NO | 2. | 7<br>13.7<br>13.5<br>3.4 | 10<br>19.6<br>15.2<br>4.9 | 24<br>47.1<br>42.9<br>11.8 | 9<br>17.6<br>36.0<br>4.4 | 1<br>2.0<br>20.0<br>0.5 | 51<br>25.0 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 52<br>25.5 | 66<br>32.4 | 56<br>27.5 | 25<br>12.3 | 5<br>2.5 | 204<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 18.31023 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0011

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 118

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR096

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR096 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 28<br>18.4<br>87.5<br>13.8 | 49<br>32.2<br>84.5<br>24.1 | 38<br>25.0<br>74.5<br>18.7 | 27<br>17.8<br>73.0<br>13.3 | 10<br>6.6<br>40.0<br>4.9 | 152<br>74.9 |
| NO | 2. | 4<br>7.8<br>12.5<br>2.0 | 9<br>17.6<br>15.5<br>4.4 | 13<br>25.5<br>25.5<br>6.4 | 10<br>19.6<br>27.0<br>4.9 | 15<br>29.4<br>60.0<br>7.4 | 51<br>25.1 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 32<br>15.8 | 58<br>28.6 | 51<br>25.1 | 37<br>18.2 | 25<br>12.3 | 203<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 21.79617 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0002

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

TABLE 119

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR081

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR081 1. VERY CRITICAL PR | 2. IMPORTANT PROBLE | 3. OCCASIONAL PROB. | 4. MINOR PROBLEM | 5. NOT A PROBLEM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 37<br>24.2<br>78.7<br>18.1 | 75<br>49.0<br>82.4<br>36.8 | 27<br>17.6<br>60.0<br>13.2 | 8<br>5.2<br>72.7<br>3.9 | 6<br>3.9<br>60.0<br>2.9 | 153<br>75.0 |
| NO | 2. | 10<br>19.6<br>21.3<br>4.9 | 16<br>31.4<br>17.6<br>7.8 | 18<br>35.3<br>40.0<br>8.8 | 3<br>5.9<br>27.3<br>1.5 | 4<br>7.8<br>40.0<br>2.0 | 51<br>25.0 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 47<br>23.0 | 91<br>44.6 | 45<br>22.1 | 11<br>5.4 | 10<br>4.9 | 204<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.64815 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0468

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 3

TABLE 120

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR091

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR091 1. BECOME M UCH MORE | 2. BECOME S LIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANG E | 4. BECOM SL IGHTLY L | 5. BECOME M UCH LESS | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 46<br>30.3<br>85.2<br>23.1 | 66<br>43.4<br>83.5<br>33.2 | 29<br>19.1<br>56.9<br>14.6 | 9<br>5.9<br>75.0<br>4.5 | 2<br>1.3<br>66.7<br>1.0 | 152<br>76.4 |
| NO | 2. | 8<br>17.0<br>14.8<br>4.0 | 13<br>27.7<br>16.5<br>6.5 | 22<br>46.8<br>43.1<br>11.1 | 3<br>6.4<br>25.0<br>1.5 | 1<br>2.1<br>33.3<br>0.5 | 47<br>23.6 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 54<br>27.1 | 79<br>39.7 | 51<br>25.6 | 12<br>6.0 | 3<br>1.5 | 199<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 15.50693 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0038

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 8

TABLE 121

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR097

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR097 1. BECOME M UCH MORE | 2. BECOME S LIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANG E | 4. BECOM SL IGHTLY L | 5. BECOME M UCH LESS | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 50<br>33.8<br>80.6<br>25.3 | 63<br>42.6<br>84.0<br>32.5 | 30<br>20.3<br>65.2<br>15.5 | 3<br>2.0<br>50.0<br>1.5 | 2<br>1.4<br>40.0<br>1.0 | 148<br>76.3 |
| NO | 2. | 12<br>26.1<br>19.4<br>6.2 | 12<br>26.1<br>16.0<br>6.2 | 16<br>34.8<br>34.8<br>8.2 | 3<br>6.5<br>50.0<br>1.5 | 3<br>6.5<br>60.0<br>1.5 | 46<br>23.7 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 62<br>32.0 | 75<br>38.7 | 46<br>23.7 | 6<br>3.1 | 5<br>2.6 | 194<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.16525 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0162

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

TABLE 122

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR082

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR082 1. BECOME M UCH MORE | 2. BECOME S LIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANG E | 4. BECOM SL IGHTLY L | 5. BECOME M UCH LESS | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 60<br>40.0<br>78.9<br>30.5 | 65<br>43.3<br>84.4<br>33.0 | 23<br>15.3<br>57.5<br>11.7 | 1<br>0.7<br>50.0<br>0.5 | 1<br>0.7<br>50.0<br>0.5 | 150<br>76.1 |
| NO | 2. | 16<br>34.0<br>21.1<br>8.1 | 12<br>25.5<br>15.6<br>6.1 | 17<br>36.2<br>42.5<br>8.6 | 1<br>2.1<br>50.0<br>0.5 | 1<br>2.1<br>50.0<br>0.5 | 47<br>23.9 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 76<br>38.6 | 77<br>39.1 | 40<br>20.3 | 2<br>1.0 | 2<br>1.0 | 197<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.38778 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0147

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

TABLE 123

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR115

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR115 1. BECOME M UCH MORE | 2. BECOME S LIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANG E | 4. BECOM SL IGHTLY L | 5. BECOME M UCH LESS | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 23<br>15.4<br>92.0<br>11.7 | 60<br>40.3<br>84.5<br>30.6 | 61<br>40.9<br>67.3<br>31.1 | 3<br>2.0<br>50.0<br>1.5 | 2<br>1.3<br>66.7<br>1.0 | 149<br>76.0 |
| NO | 2. | 2<br>4.3<br>8.0<br>1.0 | 11<br>23.4<br>15.5<br>5.6 | 30<br>63.8<br>33.0<br>15.3 | 3<br>6.4<br>50.0<br>1.5 | 1<br>2.1<br>33.3<br>0.5 | 47<br>24.0 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 25<br>12.8 | 71<br>36.2 | 91<br>46.4 | 6<br>3.1 | 3<br>1.5 | 196<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.71167 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0126

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 11

TABLE 124

VAR008 ENGAGE IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY VAR100

| VAR008 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR100 1. BECOME M UCH MORE | 2. BECOME S LIGHTLY | 3. NO CHANG E | 4. BECOM SL IGHTLY L | 5. BECOME M UCH LESS | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 47<br>31.3<br>78.3<br>23.9 | 76<br>50.7<br>81.7<br>38.6 | 24<br>16.0<br>61.5<br>12.2 | 1<br>0.7<br>33.3<br>0.5 | 2<br>1.3<br>100.0<br>1.0 | 150<br>76.1 |
| NO | 2. | 13<br>27.7<br>21.7<br>6.6 | 17<br>36.2<br>18.3<br>8.6 | 15<br>31.9<br>38.5<br>7.6 | 2<br>4.3<br>66.7<br>1.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 47<br>23.9 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 60<br>30.5 | 93<br>47.2 | 39<br>19.8 | 3<br>1.5 | 2<br>1.0 | 197<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.98331 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0407

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

TABLE 125

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAF BY VAR086

| VAR004 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR086 1. VERY CRT ICL PROBL | 2. IMPORT. PROBLM | 3. OCCASION AL PROBM | 4. MINOR PR OBLM | 5. NOT FROM Y PROBLM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 1. | 12<br>16.9<br>70.6<br>7.4 | 26<br>36.6<br>44.1<br>16.0 | 13<br>18.3<br>28.9<br>8.0 | 11<br>15.5<br>47.8<br>6.8 | 9<br>12.7<br>21.4<br>5.6 | 71<br>43.8 |
| NO | 2. | 5<br>5.5<br>29.4<br>3.1 | 33<br>36.3<br>55.9<br>20.4 | 32<br>35.2<br>71.1<br>19.8 | 12<br>13.2<br>52.2<br>7.4 | 9<br>9.9<br>78.9<br>5.6 | 91<br>56.2 |
| | COLUMN TOTAL | 17<br>10.5 | 59<br>36.4 | 45<br>27.8 | 23<br>14.2 | 18<br>11.1 | 162<br>100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 9.55266 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0487

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 13

TABLE 126

VAR004 COLL. BARGAINING WITH INSTRUCTIONAL STAF BY VAR074

| VAR004 | COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT | VAR074 1. VERY CRT CL PROBL | 2. IMPORT. PROBLM | 3. OCCASIONAL PROBM | 4. MINOR PROBLM | 5. NOT PRSNT PROBLM | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. YES | | 16 | 26 | 23 | 2 | 3 | 70 |
| | | 22.9 | 37.1 | 32.9 | 2.9 | 4.3 | 43.8 |
| | | 76.2 | 40.0 | 41.8 | 18.2 | 37.5 | |
| | | 10.0 | 16.3 | 14.4 | 1.3 | 1.9 | |
| 2. NO | | 5 | 39 | 32 | 9 | 5 | 90 |
| | | 5.6 | 43.3 | 35.6 | 10.0 | 5.6 | 56.3 |
| | | 23.8 | 60.0 | 58.2 | 81.8 | 62.5 | |
| | | 3.1 | 24.4 | 20.0 | 5.6 | 3.1 | |
| COLUMN TOTAL | | 21 | 65 | 55 | 11 | 8 | 160 |
| | | 13.1 | 40.6 | 34.4 | 6.9 | 5.0 | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 12.48424 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0141

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 15